THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Time brings its changes as well as its revenges. 'When we were very young' many of us can remember that the other-worldly view of religion was still prevalent. We sang hymns that voiced a longing for future bliss. Even children were taught to sing, 'I'm a little pilgrim, and a stranger here.' Our real life was beyond the grave. But this idea was fading away even then. We were re-acting against it in the name of reality. We were convinced that this world was good, and that we must justify our Christianity here and now. It may be said that to-day the this-worldly view of religion holds the entire field.

But Dr. Edwyn Bevan has brought the older view back, and with no uncertain emphasis. This is the purport of his remarkable book, *Christians in a World at War* (S.C.M.; 6s. net). No one can have anything but respect for Dr. Bevan's thinking and writing, and he has certainly issued a startling challenge to us all in what he calls his 'essay.' It is an attempt to see the present European conflict in its setting, so far as that is constituted by the obstinate hope which has characterized, throughout these nineteen centuries, the view taken in the Christian Church of earthly events. This obstinate hope is based on the belief that the real world is the eternal world, and that all problems are solved there, and that this world can only be rationalized by reference to the real world.

Men are asking whether the world process as a whole into which they are launched at birth has any meaning or purpose or goal, when it allows the occurrence of these shattering catastrophes that confound high-built hopes and show a vast power of destruction granted to the evil will. Can God be seen in history, if by 'God' we mean Someone in whom all good finds its complete realization? If we talk of a divine purpose or plan for the course of events on earth, we can only mean that it is somehow adjusted to secure that the values recognized by the spirit of man (moral goodness, truth, happiness) should be brought by the plan into actual existence to the greatest extent possible, and their opposites done away.

Do we see this in the course of these nineteen hundred years? Dr. Bevan says 'No.' Newman said that when he looked at the world's movement, hoping to see God in it, he experienced the same unpleasant feeling as he would, if he looked into a mirror, expecting to see his face and saw no face there! And Dr. Bevan agrees with Newman. He does not see God in history. Partially, perhaps. There are values that become actual—beautiful goodness, heroic courage, the genius of the artist. And in these we may recognize a manifestation of God. But, when we look at the earth as a whole, God's will is as far as ever from being done in it as it is in heaven. It is a world in which good and evil are so inextricably mixed that it seems a matter of subjective mood to pronounce whether the good or the evil predominates.

It is difficult to say that we can see any progress

in history as a whole, except such as depends on the advance of knowledge and power. And the problem for faith is: how are we in any sense to conceive of God directing or 'overruling' history, if He allows the evil will of men so largely to determine it? And this other problem (or perhaps the same problem otherwise expressed): to what end is God directing the process? No doubt a just state of things has a better chance of enduring than an unjust state of things. But some unjust states of things have endured for hundreds of years, and some relatively just states of things have been brought to a speedy end by accidents of the environment.

No doubt also any one who wills evil finds the result in the end disappointing and bitter, finds that he has in truth missed his true good by choosing it. It is a cardinal doctrine of Christianity that this is so. But Christianity only affirms that it is so because it extends its views of the individual's existence beyond earthly life. If the view is limited to earthly horizons it would be impossible to show that disappointment and bitterness always follow the choice of evil. Selfish or sensual men of a hale bodily habit may, when they draw near to the end of a long life, feel that they have had, on the whole, a good innings and as much enjoyment as should satisfy a reasonable man. It is hard to see how we could pronounce that evil, within the compass of such a life, has proved self-destructive.

The Christian way of dealing with these facts is to affirm that man's life here is but a little bit of life. This affirmation holds a large place in our Lord's teaching. Dr. BEVAN gives two pages of quotations, from the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus to the judgment scenes and including incidental sayings. According to Jesus, well-doing and well-being are in accord in the other world. And this is in agreement with the intense conviction which is commonly held that God is just. The man who does right ought, we feel, to reap happiness, and the man who does wrong unhappiness. That at any rate was the conviction of Plato and Kant. They could neither of them make sense of the universe unless there was a life beyond death in which happiness was attached to well-doing and unhappiness to evil-doing.

Further: the process of man's history on earth is bound sooner or later to come to an end. Life cannot continue on this planet for ever. It may come to an end by a cosmic cataclysm; it may peter out by degrees. And then the globe will continue to whirl in space, a dead world, like the moon to-day. If man has no future except on this planet, all the millions who have lived here will be extinct. This view is compatible only with atheism. If God, on the other hand, will exist as Eternal Spirit after the globe perishes, the human spirits with whom He has entered into communion will also live as undying spirits. If this is so it makes a great difference to the way in which we regard the course of the world around us—the national interests, the social movements, the achievements and losses of our generation, the wars and desolations.

The direction in which to look for the future of mankind, Dr. BEVAN says, is not along the course of history on this planet. It is obliquely *across* the historical process, not along it, that the millions of human spirits are always streaming. This life is only a platform where they remain for a moment on their journey to the unseen world. The future for the streaming generations is out there. The groups which seem so permanent—the family, the society, the nation—are merely frames within which during their time on earth human spirits are brought together to be exercised in different kinds of fellowship. The spirits, when their time of learning here is over, pass on, and the frames when they have served their turn, will some day be broken up.

There is only one society, partially manifested on earth, which is an eternal frame, which continues as a society, in the world beyond death; and that is the Mystical Body of Christ. This (stripped of the temporal features) was the hope of the early Christians. It is obviously other-worldly —*jenseits*, as the Germans say, 'on the side beyond.' That is still the hope of the Church to-day. For the Christian this is not the important

world. This life is not life indeed. Our career is not here. They were right who sang the pilgrim songs. Even the children might well sing: 'I'm a little pilgrim and a stranger here.' For that is what we are. God will be vindicated on the other side.

This is very much what Browning says in *La Saisiaz*. It is also what the Psalmists said who had glimpses of another and better world. For them the hope meant that the inequalities of the present would be rectified. It was the spectacle of the innocent suffering and the guilty flourishing that gave birth to the belief in a future beyond death. Job had a glimpse of it for a moment in the same context. But in modern times we have had few who have stated it so clearly and definitely and as a final conviction as Dr. BEVAN. He presents it as the real solution of an age-long problem, how to square the facts of life with the sovereignty of a just and loving God. He sees the world as a place of training for souls, all the fitter for this because of the hard conditions in it; but their real destiny is elsewhere. And therefore the unseen world is the important one, not the seen.

An interesting volume has been published by Messrs. George Allen & Unwin under the title *I Believe*. The price is 15s. net. It consists of the credos, in the sense of the personal philosophies, of twenty-three distinguished (surely only in some cases 'eminent') men and women of our time.

The essays are unequal in quality. Some appear to have been published a good number of years ago, but are now provided with postscripts. Their general trend is socialistic, and their socialism is grounded in science rather than in philosophy or religion. They reflect for the most part the situation created by an abandonment of classical metaphysics and traditional religion, and are shaped by the grave social and political problems of the hour. The democratic note is more or less clearly sounded, though one contributor thinks that two cheers are quite enough for democracy (because it admits variety and permits criticism); there is no occasion to give three!

Among the better known contributors are Albert Einstein, Havelock Ellis, Julian Huxley, Sir Arthur Keith, Emil Ludwig, Bertrand Russell, and H. G. Wells. There is one definitely Christian philosopher in the group, Jacques MARITAIN; and express sympathy with Christian ideals is given by Thomas Mann and John Strachey. Sympathetic upholders of religion, as distinct from Christianity, are Lin Yutang and Beatrice Webb. While these both wait upon science, they are both persuaded that science is not enough.

The former writer advocates a kind of mysticism, such as preached by Lao-tse: 'a kind of reverence and respect for the moral order of the universe, philosophic resignation to the moral order, and the effort to live our life in harmony with this moral order.' The latter writer apparently deplores the decay of religious faith, but sees one hopeful portent: 'Men of science endowed with the religious temperament are to-day re-interpreting the mystical meaning of the universe; and it is they who may bring about a new synthesis between our discovery of the true and our self-dedication to the beautiful and the good.'

But let us glance at MARITAIN'S contribution. It combines a personal philosophy with acceptance of the Christian faith in its Catholic form. He is not of those who reject the doctrinal view of life, but for him the doctrinal view of life opens up a higher order of reality than the natural, and a personal philosophy is fortified by energies which transcend it. The philosophy which he here affirms he names 'integral humanism.'

The term humanism figures not infrequently in the pages of this volume of credos, and not only in the cultural and individualistic sense which it possesses in the context of the Renaissance. Thus Lancelot Hogben says that 'scientific humanism' is the creed he professes and the profession he tries to practise. And Thomas Mann believes in the coming of a new, a 'third humanism,' distinct from

its predecessors: for 'it will have stout-hearted knowledge of man's dark, dæmonic, radically "natural" side; united with reverence for his superbiological, spiritual worth.'

MARITAIN's integral humanism is in line with this but appears to go beyond it with its definite inclusion of the transcendent. This is seen in the other name, 'Humanism of the Incarnation,' which he uses in description of the view he would uphold. It is the view that considers man in the integrality of his natural and his supernatural being, and sets no limits *a priori* on the descent of divinity into him.

The position of this distinguished Catholic philosopher is more elaborately set forth in his recent volume entitled 'True Humanism.' There, in particular, he contrasts integral humanism with socialist or scientific humanism and maintains that any type of humanity formed apart from God and the climate of love, created by purely external and social or technical means, will but end in the bankruptcy of pharisaic pride: a pride in the collectivity of the means of production in place of the old bourgeois honour and individual enterprise.

Yet in integral humanism the socialistic emphasis remains. The distinctive character of the new Christendom which is here visualised will be that the transformation or transfiguration of man, which is from above, should extend really, and not only figuratively, to the social structures of humanity. 'It is vain to assert the dignity and vocation of human personality if we do not strive to transform the conditions that oppress these; strive to deal so that men can live worthily and gain their bread in honour.'

Canon Peter GREEN in everything that he writes is clear, sensible, and interesting. In his most recent book, *The Path of Life* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), he writes for the plain man, setting down some of his 'thoughts on the Christian life.' Each chapter is subdivided into short sections which might be used as daily readings, but there is a strong line of reasoning running through the whole. His general aim is to make clear the meaning and the issues of life, and in the course of his discussion he deals with various doubts and difficulties which beset the average mind.

Perhaps the most apposite chapter at the moment is that which treats of 'times of trial and testing.' Such a time has manifestly come upon us and upon the nations of the world to-day. And there can be little doubt that it was needed if man was not utterly to lose his soul. For God was not in all his thoughts. 'Not disbelief in God but just plain indifference to Him and forgetfulness of Him, was the chief sin of the day.' Man had grown to be full of a sense of his own sufficiency. He was saying, as he surveyed his own magnificent achievements, 'I am rich and increased in goods, and have need of nothing.' But now as he labours amid a sea of troubles he is made to feel the greatness of his need. Some happy souls find God in the sunny hours of life, but 'for most of us some trouble, a realization of the truth that we have indeed "no money," is needed to drive us back to God.'

At such times prayer becomes a necessity. It was when he was at the end of his resources and devoid of human help that Jacob wrestled at Peniel till he saw the face of God. It was with prayer that the Saviour met the troubles and crises of His ministry. 'St. Peter, and they that were with him, wondered that when all men were seeking Christ, and the ball of immediate success seemed to lie at His feet, He should rise up a great while before day, and go out into a solitary place, and pray. But when the final battle against the powers of evil drew near, when the time came when it was Christ on one side and Satan and all his armies on the other, and a world's salvation depended on the issue, then Christ turns to the place of many prayers, and we may be sure that His hours, His whole nights of prayer, there and elsewhere, were reservoirs of strength to Him.'

And by prayer through times of trial we attain to the full assurance of faith. Job lifted his head above his troubles to say, 'Though he slay me, yet

will I trust in him.' So did the prophet who declared that though all should fail, 'yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation.' This is no unique experience unattainable by the ordinary man. On the contrary, any one who will open his eyes and look round him will find men and women who seem to have everything against them, and whose burden might seem too heavy to bear, who yet go joyfully on their way, upheld by a strength which is clearly not of this world, nor of man's giving.'

But if the worst came to the worst could our faith stand the strain? We have seen countries overrun and civilized people suffering such barbarities as the brutal Assyrians inflicted on the Jews of old. If such things came upon ourselves, if all the supports of a civilized society gave way and whole classes were ruined and robbed of all hope in life, could we still trust in God and rejoice in His salvation? Christian experience gives the firm answer. Yes, it is possible. In the darkest night of trouble faith has often been found to shine most brightly, and the walls of dungeons have often echoed songs of praise. None may venture to boast, but it is the witness of many who have passed through fire and water that they found the grace of God sufficient for their need.

To many, however, there are very serious difficulties in the way of faith. 'Every day heart-broken wives, heart-broken fathers and mothers are asking, "Why did not God prevent the war? Was it because He could not? Or was it because He did not care?"' These are questions that lead us into deep waters. It may suffice here to say that the omnipotence of God in some mysterious way leaves room for man's free will. At this point God has limited His own power, and left a sphere within which man is free to do good or evil. Why was so perilous a gift given? 'Because where there is no freedom there is no virtue and no possibility of love. God did not desire sons who would be like perfect machines, working well because they could not help it. He desires sons who would serve Him freely for love's sake only.'

But could He not in His overruling providence have hindered man's sinful plans and desires from issuing in war? Doubtless He could. Why then did He not do so? 'I fear there is only one answer to that question. It is that in His infinite wisdom and love He judges the war to be a less evil than the continuance of a world such as we have seen since the Armistice. I for one would say: "We deserved nothing better." If the worst come to me personally, if I died slowly under a bombed and burning house, should I still have faith to say that? I would not dare to say Yes to that question. But I pray that I might have faith even then to say, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him."'

It must never be forgotten that this is a fallen world, not the world as God made it or wills it to be. It is a world where man's sin, in revolt against God's love, can work dreadful havoc, and where God's love can indeed save, yet so as by fire. 'If we planted thorns we must not be surprised if we do not gather grapes; if we sowed thistles we must not blame God if we reap no figs. Surely the first thing this war is calling us to is deep national repentance. That is the necessary preparation before we or our government can set about preparing for a better world for the days to come.'

But what of the innocent? What of the children? What of those who have had no control in public policy or social life? Why should they suffer? It is a bitter and mysterious thing, but we must beware of making ease and earthly comfort our standard in judging human life. 'Have we not made just these things, ease, pleasure and comfort our idols and forgotten God? . . . Perhaps we are now being called to learn and lay to heart the lesson that "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." And our wisdom will be to receive the worst that comes to us as the chastening of a loving Father. For the evil of the world must be very radical and deep-seated if the Son of God Himself died on the Cross to cure it.'

Constructive Theology.

X. Revelation.

By Professor C. H. Dodd, D.D., Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

In any act of knowing there are two factors: the given, which is beyond our control, and the activity of the mind working upon it. The mind is limited by that which is there to be known. Otherwise it is a case of fantasy or speculation and not of knowledge.

The process of knowing is spoken of as 'discovery,' when our attention is fixed upon the activity of the mind, and the object of knowledge is conceived as passive to its operations. In certain departments of knowledge it is so nearly passive that the term 'discovery' is adequate. But already at a comparatively low level in the hierarchy of knowable objects the spontaneity of the object is to be reckoned with. When living things are studied, we are obliged in some measure to wait upon the activity of the plant or animal itself, which we cannot dictate, or can dictate only at the risk of falsifying the *data*. Where we are seeking knowledge of human persons, the spontaneity of the object is still more important. The psychologist must in some measure wait for his man to 'give himself away' (even though he may perfect a technique for inducing him to do so). But there is a more thoroughgoing knowledge of persons in which the spontaneous contribution of the person known is at least as important as the mental activity of the knower. Friend knows friend, husband knows wife and wife husband, parents know their children, in a way in which the one is no longer simply an object to the other. The process is reciprocal: on each side there is both spontaneity and response. If we speak of discovery on the one side, we must speak of self-revelation on the other, and both are functions of a personal relation established between the two. In this kind of knowledge sensible phenomena still play a part—words, gestures, expressions, and the like—but they are instrumental to the person's will to be known, and convey their meaning through personal sympathy.

But in fact this element of the spontaneity of the object is never entirely absent from the process of knowledge. The object presents itself to us, and presents itself in particular ways determined not by our wishes, but by its own nature. The object is active at least in constraining us to use *these* and not *those* methods of getting to know it.

In trusting the results of our discoveries we make at least the working assumption that there is a certain correspondence between our mind and the object. This assumption justifies itself pragmatically if natural objects respond to our attempts to make use of them when we act in accordance with the knowledge of them that we have won. But it is difficult to see how our confidence in the validity of scientific knowledge can be justified theoretically except upon the hypothesis that the nature of the object itself is due to some underlying principle, or originating power, akin to our own minds. Upon that hypothesis we could account for that kind of penetrating sympathy with natural phenomena, which gives to the greatest scientific minds a strange power of divination. 'Two of the greatest men of our generation, Einstein and Rutherford, taking things as they are, have delved with poetic insight and imagination into the ultimate foundations of Nature' (A. S. Eve, *Rutherford*, 431). 'Poetic insight,' 'imagination': those expressions remind us that even of inanimate nature there is knowledge other than that which is strictly defined as scientific. The artist and poet, in so far as they rise above 'fancy' to 'imagination,' know reality through a kind of communion somehow analogous with personal relations between human beings. For them certainly knowledge partakes of the character of revelation.

If upon such grounds we take the view that there is a real correspondence between the mind and its objects, amounting at its highest to something like personal communion, we are well on the way to a theory that God, either as the Creator of the world and of man, or as Reason immanent both in the order of nature and in the conscious mind, is revealing Himself over the whole field of human knowledge, and that 'discovery' amounts to a response to that 'revelation.' Upon such a theory our knowledge of God bears an analogy to our knowledge of one another, since the spontaneous presentation of *data* for our minds to work upon is conceived as springing from the will of God to be

known, and our ability to respond depends upon communion with Him. But there are obvious difficulties in proceeding directly from the facts of relations which exist among finite minds, to a relation between such minds and the infinite Mind. It is in fact here that 'natural theology' finds it hardest to give a satisfactory account.

So much at least, however, we seem able to say; that 'discovery' is never a fully adequate way of describing the process of knowledge, and least of all when personal relations are in view; and that if God is personal we could account for our knowledge as depending upon a revelation on His part. And upon the same assumption we should have to go on to say that the faculty for apprehending such revelation is a function of some kind of communion between God and man. God can be known if man is 'receptive of God and capable of intercourse with Him' (τοῦ Θεοῦ δεκτικός καὶ τῷ Θεῷ συνουσιαστικός, *Corpus Hermeticum* xii. 19).

While, however, religious experience has much to say in support of such a doctrine of revelation, it contains also another element which is in conflict with it, namely, that which Otto has described as the 'numinous' or irrational element. The divine is the *Mysterium Tremendum*, the 'altogether other,' which man cannot know. In the higher religions this sense of distance from God rises to a tragic sense of estrangement. Man is not only at a distance from God by reason of his finitude, but separated from Him by a dark barrier of sin and guilt. It is not possible to abolish that barrier by simply denying it. But its consequence must be a profound distrust of man's capacity to receive any revelation from God. Thus from the side of religion itself there is a damaging criticism of such a doctrine of revelation as has been outlined.

The Christian doctrine of revelation is framed in full view of the tragic fact of the estrangement of man from God. It contemplates a revelation granted to a 'fallen' race, and starts, not from man's natural capacity to know God, but from God's free act in overcoming, from His side, the barrier which sin has established. In that act revelation and redemption are united.

God reveals Himself to us in Christ His Son, the eternal Word incarnate, through the testimony of the Scriptures and the interior testimony of the Holy Spirit. We receive His revelation by faith, which is itself the gift of God. We receive it in the context of the life of the Church, the Body of Christ, the custodian of the Scriptures, the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit. When in the fellowship of the Church we read the Scriptures, hear the Gospel of Christ proclaimed, and partake in the Sacraments (the Eucharist in particular), we believe that God deals with us, and makes Himself known as our Father, our Saviour, and our Lord.

Our attitude is one of worship, in which the distance between God and man is recognized but also bridged, not by our aspiration towards God, but by His condescension towards us in Christ. For it is the Word of God, coming to us as promise and as demand, that moves us to worship, and our worship is not initiative but response. In particular, it holds within it confession of sin and repentance, in view of God's free offer of forgiveness, as well as praise to God for what He has done, and self-dedication to His will. It is in worshipping God that we apprehend His revelation, and the apprehension is not a purely intellectual act of knowing, but a moral response to God's demand, made possible for us by His gift.

Christian worship has the distinctive character that it arises out of what God has done for us in the concrete, objective realm of historical fact. The Church itself is an historically continuous and self-identical society, whose beginning lies in particular facts of the past, without which it has no meaning. To these facts Gospel and Sacrament bear witness. The Gospel recites the historical events of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, by which our redemption was effected. In the central Sacrament of the Church we recall and set forth these events. We recall them, but in the recalling they are made present to us, since there is in them that which transcends the division of time into past, present, and future. Yet they remain historical. Our approach to the eternal God, therefore, is not purely 'mystical.' It is mediated through the historical events which are re-enacted in our worship. We lift up our hearts into the presence of God, but do not thereby move out of the historical context to which our daily lives belong. We enter rather into the full meaning of history at its centre, where the Word was made flesh; where God visited and redeemed His people.

The Gospel facts are presented to us as the 'fulfilment' of a long historical process, beginning with the call of Abraham, and continuing through the chequered career of Israel down to the time of Christ. That it begins with a 'call' is significant of the divine initiative which gives it its character as revelation. This divine initiative appears at every stage. For the Word of God through Moses and the prophets descends upon the process of events and gives them their place in the organic

structure of the *Heilsgeschichte*, that is, in history as a process of divine self-revelation.

This intervention of the Word of God is both interpretative and constitutive of the historical process. The prophets testify to the meaning which events bear in the divine purpose, and by doing so they give direction to succeeding events in the line of that purpose. (For example, the prophetic interpretation of the Babylonian captivity as the judgment of God upon the infidelity of His people, preparatory to the institution of a 'new covenant,' led directly to the creation of that unique religious and social phenomenon which is post-exilic Judaism.)

In Old Testament history, therefore, fact and prophecy, event and interpretation, weave by their interaction a fabric which shows the pattern of God's self-revelation to men. No prophetic utterance is in itself revelation, apart from the total history to which it belongs: nor is the revelation in the events themselves apart from the meaning which prophecy saw in them. The 'inspiration' of the prophets displays itself as a divinely implanted faculty of insight into the meaning of events, by virtue of which we see them as elements in a providential order revealing the living God.

Events of history, indeed, so far as they issue from human purposes and actions, could not of themselves reveal God. For all human purposes and actions are corrupted by sin. Yet they are overruled by God. The prophetic interpretation of history enables us to recognize both the hand of God in events, and the divine reaction against the sinful element in them. We discern a series of crises, in which both the judgment of God is declared against the sin of His people, and, within and behind the judgment, His pure and steadfast purpose to redeem them from their sin. Judgment and redemption proceed from a realm above and beyond history, but enter into history as a controlling factor.

The process of history as revelation reaches its climax in the coming of Christ, His death and resurrection. This complex event can be seen to be, on one side of it, the outcome of preceding events. But it is not merely the last in the series. It sums up in itself the meaning of the whole series, and fulfils the purpose of God working in it. The event includes the most signal manifestation of human sin, and the divine reaction to it in judgment. But the element of judgment is overshadowed—or rather outshone—by the immeasurable grace of God, overruling a sinful situation which lies under His judgment, to His glory and the salvation of man.

As in the history of the Old Testament the course of events became effective as revelation through the 'inspiration' granted to the prophets, so the Gospel facts become fully revealing through the Holy Spirit given to the Church. This is not to be regarded simply as a heightening of prophetic inspiration. It is the sequel of a new fact in history. That is why the New Testament, while recognizing that the Holy Spirit spake by the prophets, also says, 'Spirit was not yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified' (Jn 7^{39}). The conclusive act of God was at once upon the plane of outward fact, and upon the plane of interior illumination for the apprehension of the fact. By the Spirit we know those things which God has graciously given to us in Christ (1 Co 2^{12}), for He takes of the things of Christ and declares them unto us (Jn 16^{14}). It is in response to this twofold divine initiative that the Church confesses, 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son,' and 'God is love.' These affirmations are made, not as a simple induction from historical facts as such, nor yet directly by virtue of an interior illumination, but as the divinely guided interpretation of divinely guided events.

In terms of the formula for revelation suggested at the outset, we may say that God reveals Himself to us both by providing external, 'objective' *data* for the knowledge of Him, and by creating in us the power to apprehend the *data*; and that He does this by judging and over-ruling the sin of our fallen humanity, breaking down from His side the barrier between God and man, and drawing us, of His sheer grace, into personal communion with Himself.

To some such view of revelation we seem to be led when we consider it in the context of the Christian faith. The question arises, whether apart from this 'special revelation,' we are to recognize a 'general revelation' of God in nature and history, accessible to men in some measure, despite the Fall. There are passages in the New Testament itself which *prima facie* affirm or imply such a general revelation; notably Ac 14^{15-17} 17^{22-31}, Ro 1^{20-23} 2^{12-16}. Further, it may be argued that the parables of the Gospels, with their realistic fidelity to the facts of nature and human life upon the natural level, presuppose that those facts contain within them a clue to the truths of the Kingdom of God for those who can discern it.

There are, besides, certain considerations which should make us hesitate to impose strict limits to the scope of revelation. First, the sacred history in which God reveals Himself is upon one side continuous with all history. The events which it includes are also events of secular history. Secondly,

conceptions which demonstrably originated outside the field of the Old and New Testaments—as in primitive Semitic religion, or in Greek philosophy—are taken up as integral elements of the Christian revelation (however transformed in the process) and must therefore be of the same stuff. Thirdly, our whole response to life is largely moulded by our place in history. This is true of Christians, as of all men, and it was true of the prophets and apostles through whom the Word of God came. It seems likely that before (if we may so distinguish) the Word of God came to them, there was something which predisposed them to receive it; and this can have been no other than the prevenient grace of God working upon them in and through their historical environment.

It is, in fact, impossible to isolate the Church, the field of God's special revelation in Christ, as if it were an inviolable *enclave* within humanity. Its centre is in Christ, but it has no ultimate circumference short of the whole of mankind. The Church is the ἀπαρχή of the race, and we may apply the Pauline maxim, 'If the firstfruit is holy, so is the lump' (Ro 11[16]). What is affirmed of the Church is not denied of humanity at large. In the Church we are sons of God, but that is not to deny that He is the Father of all men. In the Church we are brothers, but not to the denial of our wider brotherhood. Christ loved the Church and gave Himself up for it; but Christ also gave Himself for the sins of the whole world. The Holy Spirit works in the Church, but to deny His operation in the world would be to put a limit to the power and love of God which are the very content of His revelation in Christ.

Indeed, the Christian believer, who has in some measure received the revelation of God in Christ (by grace, not of merit), has the best right to affirm the reality of His revelation in nature and history at large, because the God who reveals Himself in Christ is such that we must believe Him to care for all men, and therefore to give them knowledge of Himself as they are able to receive it. And if that general revelation is but dimly apprehended, even we who have the special revelation and the witness of the Spirit see only in a glass darkly. It is true that in sending Christ God created a new thing in the earth, and that in sending the Spirit He conferred upon men a specific capacity for knowing what He had done; but the 'fulness of time' at which Christ came was prepared by the mysterious working of divine Providence over the whole field of history, and the mind of man was prepared for the illumination that came at Pentecost by all hints of truth that have broken the darkness of our fallen estate.

The perspective of revelation is set forth in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. Here, while the Word in the beginning with God is logically prior, the πρότερον πρὸς ἡμᾶς is the Word made flesh, where alone for men clear knowledge of God is given ('He that hath seen me hath seen the Father'). Starting there, we are led back to the Word of God as it came to Israel through the prophets (1[11-12]), back again to the Word as the light that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world (1[4.9]), and yet again to the Word as constitutive of the whole creation (1[3]). We read the revelation of God in history and in nature by the light of His self-revelation in Christ.

Literature.

THEISM AND COSMOLOGY.

A RECENT Gifford lecturer attempted to satisfy the requirements of the Gifford Trust by showing that all theology was kerygmatic and that there was no such thing as natural theology. Professor John Laird is firmly convinced that there is a place for natural theology, and that a philosophical consideration of Nature can produce certain valuable results. But he treats it rather after the manner of a stern parent, and will not allow it to lay claim to any unjustified conclusions. In this first series of lectures he confines himself strictly within the limits indicated by the title—*Theism and Cosmology* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net)—and it would perhaps be unfair to estimate them without reference to the promise of the second series in which he proposes to deal with the subject of 'Mind and Deity' and will include vital topics which are here omitted. In the present volume Professor Laird is laying the foundations, and although he holds that natural theology must always be less than Christian, he resolutely

refuses to remove its limitations by making use of any data which do not come within his purview. Still, even with these limitations, he thinks that the enquiry is very much worth while.

He digs his foundations deep, drilling downwards by the power of a penetrative mind, and making use sometimes of highly technical phraseology, employing words which are not to be found in any ordinary dictionary. It must be confessed that his foundations are better than his superstructure, and that the latter does not rise very far above the ground. But what there is of it is very solidly based, and the author himself has a kind of wistful regret that there is not more to show for his labours. The essence of the cosmological argument is, according to him, that the world which exists is self-insufficient, and requires a divine complement, but he is doubtful about the usual arguments in favour of the first half of the statement, and more than doubtful about the transition to the second half, speaking sarcastically about the 'airy vacuity of assuming that inconclusive proofs raise a presumption in favour of their professed conclusion.' His own position is roughly pantheistic, but not crudely so. He reaches the conclusion that the world is intrinsically deiform, and that a godless world is a misconstrued world. But, though he does not altogether deny their possibility, he places little reliance upon cosmological arguments to a supra-mundane deity. This comes out most clearly in his discussion of the teleological argument. He finds teleology in Nature, but it is an inherent teleology and *not* a planned teleology. He has the greatest respect for teleology, but none at all for the argument from design. Perhaps in his second series he will raise a more conspicuous superstructure upon the foundation of inherent teleology which he has here laid so wisely and well.

CHRISTIANITY AND MORALS.

Under the above title Dr. Edward Westermarck has given us a portly volume (Kegan Paul; 23s. net). Dr. Westermarck's views on ethics are already well known, and his eminence as an anthropologist is unassailable. This work is a mine, or rather treasure-house, of information which may be at once accepted as reliable, of beliefs and practices of many peoples. We agree to a large extent with Dr. Westermarck's contention that the claims made so often from the pulpit and in popular 'apologetics' that all that is worth while in our civilization and morals is directly and solely due to Christianity is historically unsound in the sense that many a virtue inculcated by Christianity had been already inculcated. The shock may be a salutary one—to discover that in some respects the spread of Christianity was marked not by a heightening of ethical practice but by a lowering. The fundamental cause of this according to the author was the Pauline doctrine of salvation by faith alone, and other worldliness. Opinions will differ here, and probably most believers will feel that the case has been exaggerated. What seems to us the main defect of a notable work is the failure to realize that civilization and in consequence ethics was not continuous from the early days of Christianity onwards. From the fourth century for a millennium civilization and culture in Western Europe were first gradually all but obliterated and as gradually coming to new vigour. In that preservation of such light as there was and that fresh dawn the part played by the Church was greater than so far as we can see Dr. Westermarck allows.

THE REFORMED CHURCHES AND MINISTERIAL ORDER.

The Rev. James L. Ainslie, B.D., Ph.D., parish minister at Kirkfieldbank, has enriched Scottish theological literature with his book on *The Doctrines of Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches of the 16th and 17th Centuries* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d. net). That so large and so good a book should be published at so low a cost at the present time does credit to the publishers, and we hope their faith will be justified by the public reception of the work. By 'Reformed Churches' Dr. Ainslie understands those churches which adopted more or less fully the Presbyterian polity; and he holds—rightly in our opinion—that 'Ministerial Order' is better than the more familiar 'Orders.'

He is concerned to show the problems that faced the 'Reformed Churches' as to ministerial order and how they solved it. On the one hand, they attached no value to any mechanical 'succession'; on the other hand, they were concerned to do all things 'decently and in order.' While they emphasized the Godward side of leading by the Spirit they no less took all safeguards against the kind of abuse to which a charismatic ministry is exposed, by giving great importance to examination of candidates for ordination.

There has been a tendency among some Presbyterians to fall back overmuch on some theory of 'Apostolic Succession.' Dr. Ainslie shows how confused and uncertain and unsatisfactory such theories are. That we should agree with every word Dr. Ainslie writes is not important. His

main contention is of great importance—that to be called of God and imbued with God's Spirit is the primary qualification of a true minister of the gospel.

What Masonry Means, by Mr. William E. Hammond (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net), is an attempt to give a 'clear conception of Masonry as a unified system of moral instruction.' As a result we have half a score of short chapters full of wholesome, if commonplace, moral teaching, spiced with masonic terminology. 'Masonry undertakes to discipline men—chisel, square, level, plumb and polish them—into the quality and shape essential to the realization of its dream of a worthy social order.' There is nothing distinctive in this, but doubtless it will be all to the good if every mason, inspired by the bee-hive emblem of industry and warned by the scythe and sand-glass of the flight of time, should gird on the lamb-skin apron of purity and diligently ply the trowel to spread the cement of brotherly love. The book is commended in a Foreword by Dr. Fort Newton, who in one of his own works has told us that there are three types of Masonry, the Italian which is atheistic, the German which is Christian, and the British and American which is theistic. The book before us appears to belong to the last type.

Freedom and Culture, by Professor John Dewey (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), is a difficult book to read, but it goes to the heart of the matter, at least so far as this is possible for a humanist of the type of Professor Dewey. His thesis is that freedom must be, not negative and abstract, but positive and in concrete relations to actual conditions. By negative freedom he means the kind of freedom which is content merely with the destruction of existing oppressive limitations, and tends, under the influence of popular slogans, unduly to simplify its methods of investigation and action. Towards such an attitude the conditions under which American democracy came into being were peculiarly favourable. The men who founded it had just emerged from a struggle against established authority and freedom from dependence on the past was for them all-important; moreover, they were in a new country with abundant untapped resources demanding original methods for their utilization. The situation resulted in an almost wholly uncritical acceptance of generalized democratic principles, for, according to our author, most of the criticism of democracy arises out of the persistence of 'entrenched dispositions' in traditions, customs, and institutions which were in existence when there was as yet no such thing as democracy.

The failures of democracy have been due, Professor Dewey thinks, mainly to its abstract character. The ideas of the inherent freedom of man and his fundamental rights irrespective of his concrete conditions, resulted in the *laissez faire* policy, the inadequacy of which was concealed by the fact that it took to itself the credit of increased prosperity which was really due to the release, by scientific discovery and consequent control over Nature, of man's capacity for production. The practical antinomy, however, with which we find ourselves confronted, is that freedom has been unable to maintain itself except by organization, and organization, again, especially in the economic sphere, has proved itself inimical to freedom. Professor Dewey's contention is that there can be no general solution of our problems. The Marxist all-comprehensive formula, depending entirely, ostensibly at least, upon external conditions, is full of inner contradictions. The doctrine of older democracy that its main principles are founded on the nature of man, tells us nothing as to how the capacities of human nature are to be connected with the ideal in concrete conditions. The theory that the dominant psychological motives are unlimited competitiveness and limited sympathy, gets us nowhere, and the spirit of 'enterprise,' which has been so much upheld in the advocacy of democracy, is morally neutral. Professor Dewey appeals for the application to democracy of the scientific attitude, in close association with art, as a means of linking ideas with emotions. Science must cease to assert that it is indifferent to the ends for which its discoveries may be used. It must shoulder responsibility for these, and must try to offer guidance in the choice of ends as well as means. There is need of a mobilization of scientists in co-operative effort for the good of society, so that no longer will their achievements result mainly in the destruction of man in war or the economic furtherance of the interests of particular classes. Science must seek above all to create a morale of fair-mindedness, intellectual integrity, and a subordination of personal prejudices to ascertained facts. Otherwise, the only alternative is the conflict of irrational forces and the triumph of Totalitarianism. We must never forget that democratic ends demand democratic methods, if the ideal of democracy is to be realized. This ideal is, in the words of Professor Dewey, 'to secure and maintain an ever-increasing release of the powers of human nature, in service of a freedom which is co-operative, and a co-operation which is voluntary.'

Under the title '*Dawdson*' *the Doctor: G. E. Dodson of Iran*—suggestive of local colour in pronunciation and popularity with the people amongst whom he worked—the Church Missionary Society have published a well-written biography of one of their missionaries in Iran (1s. 6d. net). There are no high-lights in the story, and the experiences of Dr. Dodson are similar to those of many pioneer medical missionaries. But we are made vividly to realize the sense of need, the ability to meet that need in particular cases, the gradual growth of confidence amongst the different classes, the appalling inadequacy of resources, the struggle against difficulties such as lack of money and the hesitancies of the home authorities, the ultimate triumph in the building of the hospital, almost coincident with the sacrificial death of the Doctor who was the inspiration of the activities; and throughout all the unmistakable penetration into the hearts of the people of the spirit of the gospel of Christ. All these things are movingly told in a narrative which holds the attention from start to finish.

Two books come from the Epworth Press on the theme of religious education, and both deserve to be read since they are by experts and also by men of outstanding gifts. *The Christian and Education*, by W. G. Humphrey, M.A., D.Phil., Headmaster of the Leys School, Cambridge, deals with the function of the school for the most part. But Dr. Humphrey is not concerned merely with the religious lesson. He is a man of vision, and deals with the function of religious education as a factor in the re-making of our social system. His whole argument, conducted in such a spirit of moderation and so persuasive on that account, deserves to be widely considered. We have seldom met with a more enlightened discussion of a subject that is of vital importance at the present time.

The other book is by the Chaplain of the same school, the Rev. Conrad Skinner, M.A., *A Boy's Right to Religion; A Schoolmaster's Appeal to Parents*. As the title indicates, this is a book on the contribution which the home may make to the religious training of the child. It would be impossible to exaggerate the urgency of Mr. Skinner's subject. And if his admirable book reaches its goal it will perform a great service for the cause he has at heart. Both books are published at the modest price of one shilling.

Two more of Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton's 'Black Jacket' series have been issued, and they are both interesting and useful. One is *Daily Readings from the Moffatt Translation of the Bible* (2s. 6d. net). The book is meant to 'bring the reader into the presence of the great affirmations of the Bible.' There are two sections in each page devoted to one day of the year. The one deals with conduct, the other with faith. The selection is judicious, and the reading of these fine passages is sure to bring the reader that shock of reality which the translation often does. The type is smallish but clear, and the book will be a treasure to many, and perhaps send them to the complete translation to read the Bible as a whole.

This, at any rate, is the purpose of the other book, *A Digest of the Bible*, arranged and edited by Peter V. Ross (2s. 6d. net). It is difficult to describe this book. It is a kind of summary of the Bible with large sections of the text of Scripture embodied in a kind of narrative. So far as one can judge from a selective testing, the thing is very well done. The editor, compiler or digester, calculates that if you read fifty pages in an evening you can get over the Bible (in his digest) in less than a week. Then, of course, your appetite whetted, you will go on to read the Bible for yourself, not unhelped by Mr. Ross's guidance. The enterprise was worth attempting and the result is satisfactory, possibly a good deal more.

A new edition of the *Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland* has been made, and is introduced by the lamented Dr. Oswald Milligan, whose recent death has been a serious loss to his Church (Oxford University Press; 5s. net, leather 6s. 6d. net). The new edition combines the best features of the two books already authorized by the Church: 'Prayers for Divine Services,' 1923 and 1929, and the 'Book of Common Order,' 1928. Dr. Milligan gives in his Preface an intelligent account of the Church's desire to provide forms of service while jealously maintaining the right of free prayer. He also indicates the extent to which new material has been provided. There are, for example, four orders for the celebration of the Lord's Supper (one for private communion). There are considerably more prayers for the observance of the Christian Year as well as for special graces. The book is beautifully produced, and will be a great help to ministers for their guidance and for the enrichment of their public devotions.

Supreme Governor (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), by J. V. P. Thompson, M.A., formerly Exhibitioner of Trinity College, Cambridge, is a study of Elizabethan ecclesiastical policy and circumstance. It is pointed out that the so-called Elizabeth Settlement repre-

sented an attempt on the part of the Church of England to justify its claim to be comprehensive. The effort was made to combine something of the traditional ritual and organization dear to Romanism with a doctrinal position calculated to win the acceptance of Calvinists (though the position affirmed was Zwinglian rather than Calvinistic). But it was its political expediency rather than its making for ecclesiastical comprehension that commended the Settlement to the Queen.

In reviewing the terms of the Elizabethan Settlement the author, whose book is a solid and learned contribution to its subject, discusses in particular the early difficulties with which the enforcement of the Settlement met and the measures taken to deal with the Romanist menace, while the development of Puritanism is also outlined. In the closing chapter, 'The Settlement and the Supremacy,' it is pointed out that if there might be uncertainty as to the precise theological standpoint of the Elizabethan Church, there could be no mistaking the fact that it was a State Church, having the Queen as its effective Governor.

Paul, the Herald of God, by Sibyl Owsley (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net), tells the story of the Apostle very simply and with fidelity to the original. The only expansion is inspired by knowledge of the life of a Greek city in the first century of the Christian era. This would be a very interesting introduction to the adventurous life of St. Paul for a child and would help to make the New Testament a living book. There are four excellent maps, and many illustrations. The book is a real achievement and deserves to be widely circulated.

The Student Christian Movement Press has issued an edition of Dr. Walter M. Horton's *Contemporary English Theology* (8s. 6d. net). The book, written by an American theologian for Americans, 'has two main purposes: to promote a better understanding of English theology among my compatriots; and to cast light upon the present crisis of Liberal theology in America by describing the similar crisis through which Liberal theology in England has recently passed.' To the English reader the book is not so fresh and informing as the author's more recent work on 'Contemporary Continental Theology,' but it is good to see ourselves as others see us, and we have here a very sane and well-balanced account of some of the main tendencies in recent English theology. As the writer is specially interested in Liberalism in theology it is perhaps excusable that he gives so much attention to the early writings of R. J. Campbell, but one would venture to say that Campbell never had the influence in the English theological world which is accredited to him here. The general conclusion reached is that there is manifest a certain 'central trend' in all the streams of English theology—Catholic, Protestant, and Liberal, which makes itself felt in the Central Party in the Church of England and in the various movements towards union. Of this central trend Archbishop Temple may be taken as a representative. It should be understood that Scottish theologians do not come within the scope of this survey.

A very useful little book of devotion is *A Pocket-Book of Prayers*, for those on active service and those at home, by the Rev. Geoffrey H. Woolley, V.C., M.C., M.A. (S.C.M.; 1s. net). The book is designed to help people, whether on service or not, to form habits of prayer and to guide them in their praying. Some of the prayers are from recognized sources, some by the compiler himself. They are all brief and edifying, some of them beautiful acts of devotion. The little book would make a very acceptable present to a soldier, a sailor, or airman. It slips easily into the pocket of a uniform, and would be a helpful companion to many a man who is far away from other helps.

God at Work: A Study of the Supernatural is a reprint of a book which Dr. William Adams Brown published in America some six years ago (S.C.M.; 6s. net). It deals with the influence of the supernatural in human life as this is seen in the experiences of personal religion. It gives us some serviceable definitions, and expounds most helpfully the life of faith in relation to the mentality of the modern man. Its treatment of fundamental problems is clear, almost too facile, and leaves one with the feeling that the conclusions have been reached rather too rapidly. The description of the scientific attitude is slightly out of date, but there are many people who, without knowing it, are still struggling with back-number difficulties in this connexion, and these will find Dr. Adams Brown's book most illuminating.

The Prophetic Interpretation of History.

I.

By the Reverend G. F. Allen, Union Theological College, Tali Hsi Chow.

As I have been teaching theology in the midst of the war in China, and as I now reflect on the war in the West, I am constantly struck by two things. First, I feel how close was the historical situation of the great prophets of the eighth and sixth centuries to our own; and second, I feel how different in many respects was the interpretation which they gave to the historical events of their day, and how urgent it is that we should learn and follow their interpretation.

The prophets lived, as do we, in days of the rise and fall of great empires. They lived, as do we, in days when smaller or weaker nations were overrun by these greater neighbouring powers. They saw their own kingdom invaded, and saw Samaria fall before Assyria and later Jerusalem before Babylon. As I read the prophets of this period, I think constantly of Manchuria, Abyssinia, and Poland, and of the fall of Peiping and Nanking. I find that the situation through which I have lived in Canton throws a flood of light on the historical realities with which the prophets had to wrestle; I find that their answers throw a flood of light on the questions of our own day. At the same time, I feel how paradoxical their message sounds to our modern ways of thought, if we substitute Japan for Assyria, Germany for Babylon, Peiping or Nanking, or Warsaw for Jerusalem.

The prophets had no magical gift which enabled them to foresee and foretell future events. It is a superstitious use of their writings, when we wrest texts from their original meaning, and make them refer to long distant future times. The prophets themselves were far too intensely concerned with the historical realities of their own environment to think of a long distant future. It is, however, also a mistake if, in reaction from this superstitious interpretation of the nature of prophecy, we deny that it is an insight into coming events. In Chinese the prophet is quite rightly translated as a person who foreknows. The Second Isaiah sees the supremacy of Jahweh over the gods of Babylon mainly in the fact that Jahweh's prophets can foresee the future, whereas the Babylonian star-gazers and prognosticators fail to do so. (Cf. Is 45^{21} 47^{13} 48^{5}. Cf. also Am 3^{7} and Dt 18^{22}.) There is in such foretelling no magical prevision of future events, but rather an inspired insight into the trend of history. The prophet believes that the world is under the rule of God. He believes that he can discern the purpose of God. He knows that since God is righteous, and stable in His purpose, therefore on earth certain events are bound to lead to consequences of a certain kind. It is this prophetic insight into the meaning and trend of history which we need again to acquire, as we face the events of our own time.

'History is neither the result of the conflict between divine whims nor the outcome of human ambition; it is the development of a single great purpose.' With this sentence Dr. Oesterley sums up the prophetic attitude to history; and the sentence shall serve to mark our first contrast. In general terms Jeremiah hears the declaration of Jahweh: 'I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the face of the earth, by my great power and by my outstretched arm; and I give it unto whom it seemeth right unto me' (Jer 27^{5}). In many sentences we hear that God is the Lord of all history; and that He disposes as He chooses of the fate and destiny of nations. (Cf. *e.g.* Am 9^{7}, Ezk 29^{18-19}, Is 43^{3}.) In present-day religion we give a vague assent to the doctrine that God is Lord of history, without thinking clearly what it means; in our real thinking we have lost this bold faith. Our verdict on history is found in common sentences which express a very different view. 'Of course, it is really the militarist party in Japan who are responsible for the invasion.' 'In August the destiny of Europe was held in the decision of a single man.' Thus we speak; and with such words we confess our belief that history is precisely in our view 'the conflict of human whims or the outcome of human ambition.' Dare we say to-day that it is God who has given Abyssinia or Albania to Italy, or Manchuria to Japan? If we shrink from saying that, have we any right to say that at an earlier stage it was God who gave Canada or Australia to the British Empire? The fact is that when any particular conquest accords with our own nationalist prejudices, we accept it, and when it does not so accord we regard it as the wicked

product of human aggression. We have lost in our political judgments any sense that God is Lord and Creator of the earth, and that He controls the destiny of nations.

Perhaps we begin to feel that there is a difference between the Biblical view and our modern view of history; the contrast becomes sharper when we ask, how can we expect to discern the purpose of God in nations which do not as yet acknowledge His rule. We commonly say to-day that Russia or Japan or the present Germany are not Christian nations, and that in other nations the Christian forces are not strong enough to influence the policy of the government. Therein we assume that God can only rule where there is explicit recognition of His revelation in Christ and explicit obedience to His rule. This is precisely not the view of the prophets. The boldness of their claim for the range of God's rule is all the more striking when we remember that they had only just begun to grasp the vision and faith in one God. A short time before, it was the common belief that each nation had its own God; and doubtless such a belief still lingered in the popular religion of the prophets' time. (Cf. especially Jg 11^{24}.) When the small Jewish nation was invaded by the great neighbouring empires we might expect them to ascribe the power of these nations to the rival gods whom they worshipped. Instead of that, precisely at this time, the prophets advance into the faith that God can use another nation, whether or not that nation as yet acknowledges His rule. Thus the First Isaiah hears Jahweh say, 'Ho Assyrian, the rod of mine anger' (Is 10^{5}). Jeremiah hears Him say of Babylon a century later, 'I will send unto Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon, my servant' (Jer 25^{9}). Even more surprising, the Second Isaiah appears to use of the Persian king Cyrus the title, the anointed, that is, the Christ (Is 45^{1}). As St. Paul notices of this prophetic view, 'Isaiah is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not' (Ro 10^{20}). We have got to learn again from the prophets a far wider vision of the range of God's rule in history than commonly exists in the Churches. In the Church we meet to worship God, but the rule of God is not limited to those who thus worship Him; the God whom we worship is the God who rules the world. As the prophets saw that God could call Assyria or Babylon or Persia, so we have got to see that God might call for His purpose Germany or Russia or Japan. Behind the apparent atheism of Russia or Germany we must see that there may be a protest against a Church which had used the name of God, but had failed to set forth the reality of God. Behind the passion for social righteousness in the first days of the Communist revolution, or for national revival in the Fascist and Nazi revolutions, we have got to see that there might be the work of the God who is Lover of all nations, and who in all nations pleads the cause of the oppressed. I first discussed this at our refugee college in West China. Present at our meeting there was our doctor, who is a German Jew refugee. His knowledge of Old Testament doctrine was far more accurate than that of most Christians who share with him belief in the Old Testament. It was immensely striking to see that he at once accepted without question the position that it was God who had called to power to-day the ruler through whom he was in exile.

Let us make the contrast sharper still. God is the Lord of the enemy nation. It is the God whom we worship in our own nation who has called the enemy nation against us. We shrink from recognizing that the power of Japan or of Germany could have come from God. We shrink from associating the God whom we worship in Christ with the aggressive power of man. We must however recognize how much of our own unconscious nationalism there may be in this shrinking. We limit the favour or approval of God to our own side; we think that God must regard as His enemies those who at the moment are our enemies. Inevitably in time of war we live in the little circle of our own national loyalties, and lose the vision and the perspective that God is Lord of the world. Once more we need the contrast of the prophetic universalism. God is Lord of the enemy nation. If He favours us, He may also favour them; if He judges them, He may also use them in judgment against us. 'Behold, I will raise up against you a nation, O house of Israel, saith the Lord, the God of hosts,' as the Assyrian armies approach (Am 6^{14}). When Jerusalem is about to fall before Babylon, we read in Jeremiah: 'I myself will fight against you with an outstretched hand and with a strong arm, even in anger, and in fury, and in great wrath.' 'For I have set my face upon this city for evil, and not for good, saith the Lord: it shall be given into the hand of the king of Babylon, and he shall burn it with fire' (Jer 21^{5} 21^{10}. See also 5^{15} 20^{4}). As I think of the wreck and ruin of war which we saw in Canton, I ask whether the prophets would speak to-day of Japan, as they spoke of Assyria and Babylon in their time. Before we dismiss their language as an Old Testament picture, which cannot be reconciled with the God revealed in Christ, let us remember that Our Lord Himself

said as He faced His own oppressor, 'Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above' (Jn 19^{11}).

How can we reconcile the God of Love whom we worship in Christ with the sufferings and atrocities of war? We tend to-day to think of God as the Lord of love and gentleness and service. God is present, where this spirit is present in His Church. Perhaps we may stretch a point and admit that God is present, wherever this spirit is present in the world. Every other force of pride and cruelty and aggression is in sharp opposition to God. As Japan invades China or Germany Poland, we see nothing but the demonic powers of evil, whose fury has for the moment possessed a world which has lost the vision of God. As I revise this article to-day, I receive from England a small book of prayers. In an Introduction the writer says that the root cause of the European war is that 'organized paganism in the world has planned evil and defied God.' 'God does not will war. He has not willed or planned this war. We have been forced into it by the sins and greed of men.' These sentences without doubt represent a great deal of present Christian thought. The truth is, however, that this absolute dualism of good and evil powers is a late addition to Christian thinking from Persian sources. It does not represent the main view of the Bible. The contrast of the prophetic view seems very strange to our modern ways of thinking. It is so strange that we commonly neglect it. The prophets, in place of this dualism, held the monist view that one God is ultimate Lord over both the good and the evil in His world. 'Shall evil befall a city, and the Lord hath not done it?' asks Amos (Am 3^{6}). 'Evil is come down from the Lord unto the gate of Jerusalem,' affirms Micah (Mic 1^{12}). As Jeremiah foresees the ruin which war may cause to his city and his temple, he declares, 'Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Behold, I will bring evil upon this place, the which whosoever heareth, his ears shall tingle' (Jer 19^{3}). The Second Isaiah, who most clearly of any Old Testament writer sees the vision of monotheism, sees also that this vision can tolerate no alien power of evil in absolute opposition to God. 'I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I am the Lord, that doeth all these things' (Is 45^{6-7}). Once again we may not evade the sternness of these words, by saying that they belong to the Old Testament not the New. St. Paul follows the true tradition of Judaism, in seeing that God alone is ultimate Lord; if forces exist in the world which contradict His love it is because He Himself has handed over the world to the sway of these forces. 'Even as they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up unto a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting; being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife' (Ro 1^{28-29}). If we follow the Biblical tradition, we shall not think that God is an absentee from His world in time of war, and that alien powers of evil have assumed control. Strange though it may seem, we also shall say of the cities we love, 'Evil is come down from the Lord unto the gate of Jerusalem.' We shall learn from the prophets to discover the presence and not the absence of God amid the warfare of man.

But why should God allow these forces of evil to exist in His world? Why does not God stop the war? we used to ask from 1914–1918. To-day in the East and in the West men are asking again that question. It was asked in urgent agony during the Assyrian and Babylonian invasions of Palestine. Do not let us suppose that the cruelty of war was any less barbarous in those days. It is true that we have invented in our day terrible new instruments of destruction; but side by side with them, we have also invented far stronger means of defence and far more humane methods for the treatment of the wounded. When the prophets said that God had called Assyria or Babylon and given other nations into their hands, our picture must include the full barbarity of the conquest of one pagan power over another. The Second Isaiah says of Babylon, 'Thou didst shew no mercy; upon the aged hast thou very heavily laid thy yoke' (Is 47^{6}). The question which was repeated by Jeremiah must have been on many lips, 'Wherefore hath the Lord our God done all these things unto us?' Ezekiel answers, 'Ye shall know that I have not done without cause all that I have done in it, saith the Lord God,' as he sees the ruins of Jerusalem (Ezk 14^{23}). Jeremiah himself answers his question, 'Then shalt thou say unto them, Like as ye have forsaken me, and served strange gods in your land, so shall ye serve strangers in a land that is not yours' (Jer 5^{19}). The main line of the answer in all the prophets is that the war is a judgment from God. Because of the sins of the nation, therefore, God has called up the invader, in order that through the sufferings of war the sin may be exposed and purged. This is the central point in the prophetic interpretation of history, and the central point which we have largely lost in our interpretation. History is the manifestation and working out of the judgment of God. There is a sternness as well

as a pity in the righteousness of God. If we serve Him, we receive His blessing; if we defy His laws, then by an inevitable destiny immanent in world history we receive the penalty of our disobedience. The Archbishop of York was true to this Biblical message in his broadcast address on the eve of the war. 'If war comes it comes as the consequence of a manner of life which ignores the Law of God; it comes, in other words, as a consequence of the sin of men, and as the judgment of God upon that sin; for however true it be that the course which leads to war is a devil's course, not God's, it remains true that this is God's world, its laws are His laws, and when we reap the harvest we have sown, if it be good, that is God's blessing, and if it be evil, it is His judgment.'

From the judgment of God there follows that all nations, and in particular our own nation, stand under judgment. From the ethic of the New Testament we have learnt not to look for the mote in our brother's eye, when our vision is blinded by the beam in our own eye. It is a pressing need of our time that we should learn to apply to the inter-relationship of groups that ethic which we have in some measure learnt to apply to individual relationships. Actually, though we seldom recognize the fact, the ethic of inter-group relationships is older than that of individuals. Two centuries before the emergence of individual rights and responsibilities in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Amos had pronounced the judgment of God against the injustice of nation against nation. In his prophecy he recognizes that we must each take the judgment of God to ourselves, in penitence for the sins of our own community. He inveighs first, it is true, against the sins of surrounding nations; but he only does so, in order to lead up to the climax of the charge against his own nation; 'You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities' (Am 3^2).

In time of war the whole sin of mankind breaks out before God. It is easy then to spend our time and waste our time pointing out the sins of our enemy. Particularly in these days we talk of the sin of the aggression of Japan against China, of Italy against Abyssinia, of Germany against Poland. It is true that there is injustice in this aggression. Just occasionally in the Jewish prophets we find this note of an attack on the sins of their enemies. The prophet Nahum, for instance, is entirely occupied with a vindictive attack on the sins of the Assyrian capital, as it was about to fall before Babylon. 'Woe to the bloody city: it is all full of lies and rapine' (Nah 3^1). For the most part, however, when they were suffering from the attack of an aggressive neighbour, we find in the prophets a very different note. At such a time they dwell on their own sins, not on the sins of the other nation, as the cause of their suffering. 'Many nations shall pass by this city,' says Jeremiah of Jerusalem; 'and they shall say every man to his neighbour, Wherefore hath the Lord done thus unto this great city? Then shall they answer, Because they forsook the covenant of the Lord their God, and worshipped other gods, and served them' (Jer 22^{8-9}). Ezekiel writes in similar terms: 'The nations shall know that the house of Israel went into captivity for their iniquity; because they trespassed against me, and I hid my face from them: so I gave them into the hand of their adversaries, and they fell all of them by the sword' (Ezk 39^{23-24}). The Second Isaiah recognizes in the Servant Poems, as we all must recognize, that many innocent people in time of war seem to be caught in a suffering which they have done nothing to deserve. After the Cross, we may never say again that those who suffer are necessarily receiving the consequences of their own sin. Sin leads to suffering; but very often those who receive the suffering are not the same as those whose guilt causes the suffering. Poland and Abyssinia may have suffered, because England or America failed to play their part as the servants of God's judgment in maintaining international justice. Nevertheless the Second Isaiah also in time of war mainly thinks of the sin of his own nation. 'Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers? did not the Lord? he against whom we have sinned, and in whose ways they would not walk, neither were they obedient unto his law' (Is 42^{24}).

(*To be continued.*)

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Going On, or Going Back?

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

'So run, that ye may obtain.'—1 Co 9[24].

I suppose most children have read, or have had read to them, *Alice in Wonderland* and *Alice Through the Looking Glass*. I sometimes think grown-ups read these books more than children do to-day. Anyway I often dip into them and I always find something to make me laugh, and sometimes something to make me think; and I thank Lewis Carroll very heartily for both.

One day I struck at random into *Alice Through the Looking Glass* and found Alice running with the Red Queen. 'The most curious part of the thing was that the trees and other things round them never changed their places at all; however fast they went, they never seemed to pass anything!' When they stopped running they found themselves just where they were when they started and Alice was puzzled and disappointed, and said so. 'In our country,' said Alice, 'you'd generally get somewhere else if you run very fast for a long time, as we've been doing.' 'Here,' said the Red Queen, 'it takes all the running *you* can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else you must run twice as fast as that.'

So, in the world on the other side of the Looking Glass, Alice had to run very hard to stay where she was! Funny? Yes: but that is not only a funny thing in Alice's dream world: it is the truth about the world we live in.

As I write I can look out across the river Tagus. I see four fishing boats arriving home with their catches. Since I began to write they haven't moved an inch; they are exactly where they were when I first saw them. Yet their sails are full of wind; I can see white foam at their bows, and the water behind them. They are not really standing still. They are moving fairly fast, about four and a half miles an hour, in fact; and yet they are just holding their own.

Of course you can guess why: the tide is against them. It is ebbing at four and a half miles an hour and they are sailing at the same speed. They are sailing as fast as they can and not gaining an inch. They would need, like Alice, to go a good deal faster to get anywhere. If they could spread more sail and catch more wind, they would get somewhere. But as it is, it takes them all they can do to stay where they are until the wind strengthens, or the tide turns when they will come home with the tide.

In life, too, there is a tide that is against goodness and sometimes runs very strongly. It is doing so to-day. Russia is against all religion; Germany's leaders are against Christianity; and what the Bible calls 'the spirit of this present world' is always against Christianity; and all these things make it hard to be a Christian to-day. We must run quite hard to stay where we are.

Now sometimes we do very well if we hold our own and don't actually go back; and we must not be discouraged if we are managing to do that much.

But we must not be content with that for ever. In the world of business, firms which are content to do that, very soon find themselves slipping back. The business world says, 'Go on, or go back.'

Twenty-two years ago there was a 'War to end war'; and when it ended and Peace was made, we thought Peace had come to stay. We thought it would stay without watchful safeguarding or effort to help it. We slacked off, we disarmed, and suddenly we found that we were not staying where we were, but slipping back towards war. Now we are at war and peace is gone. We will have to make great efforts to win it back; and when we have won it back, go on with ceaseless efforts to keep it.

In every walk of life, life says to us 'Strive.' That is what Jesus said to *His* disciples, and it's what He says to us.

We have to push against a tide which is pushing against us; and we are meant not only to hold our place, but to go on with unceasing effort to win a higher place. We must run hard even to stay where we are and if we 'want to get somewhere else we must run twice as fast.' If we think we can rest on our oars we soon find ourselves slipping back. That is the law of life.

So take this business of being a disciple of Jesus Christ seriously. There is no point, no age, at which we can say, 'Now I can ease off.' 'Watch and pray,' Jesus said, 'lest ye enter into temptation.' 'I don't count myself as one who has reached the goal,' says St. Paul, 'I press forward.'

Not very long ago there was a football match between England and Italy. Italy was leading by two goals to one halfway through the second half. Then she thought that if she simply held on to her

lead the game was hers. She stopped attacking and contented herself with defensive tactics thinking she could stay where she was. Before she knew it England had equalized and in a few minutes more had snatched the victory out of Italy's hands!

How often has that happened in your own hockey matches. The game is never won till it is finished, and the only way to win is to go 'all out' all the time, until the whistle blows. In the great game of Christian life it is the same. We must run very hard to stay where we are, and a great deal harder than most of us do, to get somewhere. The Kingdom of God won't come by people sitting still. The battle of character has no breathing spaces. We can't rest on our oars or the tide will sweep us back. We can't 'retire' as men can from business. We must 'fight the good fight with all our might'—the fight against sin in our heart and evil things in the world without—until the bugles blow for victory.

Standing By.

By the Reverend S. Greer, M.A., Ayr.

'If he lose one of them.'—Lk 15^4.

Here is a fine story of something that happened when certain warships were passing through very dangerous waters. A squadron of cruisers and destroyers was steaming for home after landing troops in Norway when the signal was given to 'stay progress,' as an emergency had arisen on one of the warships. It was an extremely risky proceeding, for the waters were full of perils, and there was the grave danger of attack from the air on stationary ships. And the cause of it was that a bluejacket had to be operated on immediately for appendicitis. So all the ships slowed down, then stopped, and formed a protective circle round the ship in which the operation was being carried out. While that poor fellow lay unconscious under the surgeon's hand those big ships kept watch. A Dornier flying-boat came close, but was driven off by the guns of the protecting ships. For a whole hour the squadron kept its vigil and stood by, giving that man a chance for his life. Then the signal was passed to proceed on their journey to a Scottish port.

Splendid, wasn't it? We always admire unselfishness when we see it. We feel that folk who don't think about themselves have caught something of Christ's spirit.

There's a selfish little elf that sometimes peeps over your shoulder and looks out of your eyes. It always wants to get its own way. It must have the cake at table which it is fond of, and choose the game that is to be played, and sulks if it doesn't get it. Everything must suit it, no matter what others may wish. It has never even heard of 'give-and-take,' and as for 'sharing,' it is other folk who must do it. How ugly selfishness looks when you see it in others, or they see it in you!

What are we to do with that selfish little elf who lives in us and is always trying to lift up its voice? Hit it hard! Say to it, 'Do you think you're me, you selfish little creature?'

How unselfish Jesus was! He had never a thought for Himself, but always for others. As He tells us this story about a shepherd who risked his life for a single sheep that had strayed, it is of Jesus we keep thinking. You can picture the foolish creature just nibbling on without looking up, never thinking where it was going, until it got into difficulties out of which it couldn't escape. How piteously it bleated. Isn't that how we ourselves get into trouble? We don't think. We don't look up—to God.

But God cares for each of us as if we were the only person in all the world. So we must say to ourselves, 'I must never do anything that would bring pain to Him, or hurt a love so great.' And if we have got into trouble through our temper or our selfishness, and feel that everything's gone wrong, just ask His help and He will come to you. If we ask Him, He will always stand by.

Just one sailor, and the great ships stood round protectively. Just one sheep, and the shepherd risked everything for it. Just one girl or boy in trouble, but how much Christ cares!

The Christian Year.

Eighth Sunday after Trinity

Complete Religion.

By the Reverend A. D. Harcus, M.A., Ealing, London.

'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?'—Mic 6^8.

What was the right way to approach God? The way of sacrifice was the answer of the day. When the need of God became urgent the sacrifice would increase in quantity and in quality—thousands of rams and ten thousands of rivers of oil, and when in despair, shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? But here we have the answer of the prophet Micah, the summing up of eighth-century prophecy.

It is, firstly, to do justly. He echoes Amos with an insistence on human conduct, on righteousness. 'Let judgment run down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream.' And this is in accord with the mood of our own day with its emphasis on right conduct as the basis of true religion. Not the profession of faith but the acts of life, these are the tests by which men try us. And there can be no complaint of this for justice is the framework of life. Amos had his vision of the Lord with a plumb-line in his hand. A familiar sight to-day is of a great building in its early stages of construction, the steel frame standing out in sharp outline against the sky. What a message is there of straight lines and right angles. Clothed with bricks and timber, decorated and adorned, it will be a building of beauty and charm. So the community is built up; whatever be its outward adorning, it must have at heart the frame-work of justice. And the individual must face the test. What doth the Lord require? The answer concerns our daily lives; what are we doing? It is practical and fair. No building would stand the passage of the years if its walls were out of true. The soul is planned for eternity and in its building some principle of construction is demanded. The answer centres in the word uprightness.

The second requirement is to love mercy. The very sound of the words in the A.V. indicates a difference, the sharp clear note of the one melts into the softer tones of love and mercy. And we are indeed in a different world. To do justly suggests the rule and compass. Amos himself spoke of the plumb-line. The very word upright is a picture. But when we love mercy we go from the letter to the spirit, out of the region of measurements into the sphere of values. In general terms, to do justly is the message of Amos, loving mercy is the discovery of Hosea. Only a few years in time separate these two great pioneers in religion, but the difference in outlook is profound. 'Justice, not sacrifice,' says Amos in effect; 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice,' are the actual words of Hosea. We need not scan too carefully the exact meaning of mercy. It is the conception of life portrayed in the word that is important—insight, sympathy, kindness, love itself—all these and more. It is a way of looking at life that is stressed. And again how much it is in accord with the progressive thought of our time. The demand for mercy finds practical expression in hospitals, the care of children, of old people, a concern for poverty. In another sphere there is the softening of the criminal law, in the conception of punishment the idea of reformation rather than mere repression of the offender. The best part of the history of the last hundred years is in this second condition of approach to God.

Before the third condition is considered let a difficulty be faced. Two virtues have been stressed and approved, but virtues are sometimes contradictory. There is more than a hint of possible opposition between justice and mercy; indeed, to reconcile these has always been the task of the moralist and the lawmaker. It is comparatively easy to do justly, while loving mercy is in accord with the warm impulses of the heart. But how to do these together and fulfil the requirements of both, that is the question. True religion is not addition only, an adding of the second to the first. There is need of some kind of merging until they become not two but one. The complete Christian is not he who at the appropriate time does justly, and also on the right occasion loves mercy. We know well from experience the constant need of a justice that is true mercy and a mercy that simply must fulfil the requirements of righteousness.

With that difficulty in mind let the third condition be considered, to walk humbly with our God. Is it without meaning that, while the stressing of the two virtues, justice and mercy, has led to the practical difficulty of reconciling their claims, all the time there has been the gradual elimination of the third condition of religion? So long as justice and mercy are stressed we win approbation, but our generation is apt to part company with us when we speak of walking humbly with God. Walking humbly means many things but surely it means one thing in particular, learning from God, asking Him to teach us how to live. And it is just this knotty problem of reconciliation that the Christian faith solves. Reading the life of our Lord can it be said that justice is opposed to mercy? They are not in His life, and certainly they are not separated in the Cross where they come together in the great message of redemptive judgment. The hope was dawning in Old Testament days. The Psalmist could foresee the time when 'mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other.' In our quest for complete religion we must not only stress the individual virtues. It is the glory of our age that these have already won pre-eminence, and yet the problem of life has not been solved. The very stressing of the qualities increases the difficulty of reconciliation. There remains the hope of a clearer insight into the mind and purpose of God. It may be we must cease to be 'practical,' and stress such things as worship

and prayer. And we shall find that the advice is very practical. To walk humbly with God is more than a beautiful phrase, it is a picture of life lived in fellowship with God in daily experience, walking with God. As if He were by our side just as the actual difficulties arise—we the pupils, He the teacher. Walking humbly, is that the heart of the difficulty? Some one has said that modern man finds it easy to do justly, easy to love mercy but very difficult to walk humbly with his God. 'He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good.' The knowledge is readily available. The gospel is that advanced knowledge the world needs to-day. Let us then concentrate on this third condition, a return to God. The paraphrase version of Hosea's words puts it in a verse consecrated by many dear memories:

Come, let us to the Lord our God
with contrite hearts return;
Our God is gracious, nor will leave
the desolate to mourn.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Darkness and Light.

BY PROFESSOR G. D. HENDERSON, D.D., D.LITT., ABERDEEN.

'Out of darkness into his marvellous light.'—1 P 2[9].

All of us belong to many spheres of interest and activity. In some of them we are near the circumference; but each has some circle of which he is the centre. How different was the position that Bob Cratchit occupied in the office of Mr. Scrooge from that which he held in his own home: in the one he was the merest tool; in the other he was the very life of the place. This fact, that there is some circle or other in which one is of consequence, where one may pose as a success, affects one's estimate of oneself, and one's attitude to oneself. How clever we all are! There are such hosts of things to be good at that it would be remarkable if the great majority of people could not find some cause for having a good conceit of themselves. If their looks are disappointing, their respectability may be beyond suspicion. If their scholarship is weak they may be able to tell a funny story. If one cannot be the first to fly the Atlantic one might be an expert at dominoes. A complete failure may be a champion inventor of excuses. There we are; all in our own way terribly important! The trouble is that this results in such a lack of any proper sense of proportion, a condition of self-satisfaction which is perfectly calamitous. Our expertness in some corner of a corner of something blinds us to our uselessness and ignorance with regard to nearly everything. Yet surely a true sense of proportion is above all things necessary to make a life really worth while for the person himself and for those about him.

It is a great thing when any one has been brought like Johnson's Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia, to wondering whether there may not be a wider world outside in which he ought to be playing a part rather than sitting pridefully at home in his narrow Happy Valley. The true man will have this divine discontent. As Hew Binning, an old Scottish Covenanter, has written: 'The soul is framed with a higher capacity, and can no more be satiated with visible things than a man that is hungry can be satisfied with gold.' And so people have to be brought simply to a realization of their own proper nature and its possibilities. Too many are content to be less than their real selves, as if (as some one has put it) we were to settle down for our lives at an inn instead of carrying on with our journey. So many reach finality hurriedly, demanding, and living upon the admiration of their little circle, unconscious of the opportunities and the challenge of great worlds outside. And the word for them is in the Book of Revelation: 'Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked, I counsel thee. . . .' More divinely human, more true to themselves, are the restless type; Moses, 'choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season'; Nehemiah, who might have stayed in his comfortable post as cupbearer to the Great King, but preferred to be a pioneer in the forlorn hope expedition that set out across the desert to build a New Jerusalem; Luther, arraigned before a whole hostile world, declaring his convictions, and saying, 'Here I stand; I can do no other'; the Scottish Covenanters deciding to obey God rather than men and suffering accordingly in the Killing Time. All these felt a need, and heard a call and made a decision, which obliged them at any cost to rise above their past and their environment and be their real selves.

Would it be straining things too far to imagine Blind Bartimæus as another hero of this type? St. Mark describes him at his accustomed place by the roadside near Jericho, begging. Not a great career, but an easy one, and relatively comfortable and profitable. He took advantage, as we are all so inclined to do, of his infirmity. It made difficult

choices and hard work impracticable. No one could expect much of a blind man. And so it might have been to the end. But his soul was not dead within him; and when the miracle-worker passed and Bartimæus heard who it was, he made a most momentous decision—to let himself be cured. 'Lord that I might receive my sight.' It is not every one who shows that kind of courage, who will deliberately throw away what protects him from responsibility and trouble, and will dare to seek a really bigger world and a higher life. As a blind man we can think of Bartimæus as safe; but as a man with sight he became one of the ordinary, uninteresting unemployed—except for this, that now he could see. For him the darkness was past and the true light was shining. It meant a choice between a lower and a higher, but did it not also mean paying the price, making a sacrifice? It was the same when St. Augustine, after being for long convinced that Christianity was true, decided to admit it, and as a consequence of the admission to forgo the kind of life that had come to mean so much for him. And it is the same to-day when any one makes a decision for Christ. It means giving up as well as giving in; it means sacrifice.

At the same time it does mean the change from darkness to light. In the East this metaphor is perhaps more telling than with us, because of the extraordinarily rapid change which dawn makes. The sun rises suddenly, and quickly mounts the sky. The earth quivers; the mist rises; literally, the day breaks, and the shadows flee away. And just like that is the experience of those who 'close with Christ,' as the old evangelists used to put it. It is a matter of the presence or the absence of God. Darkness brooded over the face of the waters, and God said, Let there be light; and then life began. The Lord is my Light, said the Psalmist. The *Nunc Dimittis* claims that Christ is come to be 'a light to lighten the Gentiles.' St. Paul reminds the Corinthians that 'God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' Jesus said: 'He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.' And St. Peter chants 'the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.' Always the same story. To have Christ, and that alone, is to have light. It is as if the sun has risen upon life. 'The darkness is past and the true light now shineth.'

Let us think it conceivable then that we might be different. Let us realize the possibility of breaking out from a narrow contentment, from those limitations which we have so carelessly come to accept as inevitable and final. Was not Browning's judgment right when he preferred the failure of the 'high man with a great thing to pursue' to the success of 'that low man' who self-complacently achieves his little aim? Shall we not in faith release our real self and risk letting it breathe and grow and live in a wider world? There is constantly this choice between a higher and a lower, with all the bother and trouble of sacrifice involved in it; yes, but at the same time with all the promise, for the New Testament says: 'If a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him'; 'God is light, and in him is no darkness at all'; 'Believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light'; 'Walk as children of light.' That is Christ's offer to make things different for us if we will let Him, to make life brighter, to give things new meaning, to help us to be our real selves, to arrange things for us in some kind of proper proportion, and to shed light on things, to give us light on our problems great and small, our decisions trifling or critical. In His light we shall see light; we shall walk in the light; and our lives shall 'show forth the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvellous light.'

Tenth Sunday after Trinity.

The Secret of Endurance.

'Like one who saw the King Invisible, he never flinched.'—He 11^{27} (Moffatt).

Jesus Christ can never be explained. He cannot even be understood until He is accepted as Lord and Teacher. In the fullness of time He became incarnate, God manifest in human form. But heroic adventurers in the realm of spiritual achievement saw His day from afar and were made strong. They believed that a divine purpose was working itself out in humanity to some magnificent consummation, and felt sure that the Invisible King was interested in their response to a beckoning vision. And now, centuries after Jesus rose in triumph over death, great souls find encouragement to endure through beholding the same Invisible King. The writer to the Hebrews makes the bold affirmation regarding Moses—probably, apart from Jesus, the mightiest benefactor of the human race the world has known—that faith in the King Invisible was the secret of His superb endurance. 'Like one who saw the King Invisible, he never flinched.'

'And faith is not belief in spite of evidence, but life in scorn of consequence.' Christ shows the way to a life of moral endurance. He has always done it. He will always do it, offering the challenge of Love's Leadership to valiant souls who believe in a city whose founder and architect is God. Moses endured, for he saw the Invisible King. He underwent each terrible ordeal without giving way, he never broke down when plans were broken up, he calmly faced every crisis Israel had to undergo without going under. Like one who saw the King Invisible, Moses never flinched. Nothing moved him once he was sure of God. To a task of colossal and staggering difficulties he was called, and from it he never swerved. A tangled skein of individuals lacking purpose and cohesion he wove into an amazingly tenacious community. History can furnish no parallel to it. That the purposeful endurance of one man should create Jewish racial consciousness that has persisted through centuries of gruelling persecution is a miracle that remains inexplicable without God. For the Jewish race cannot boast of the qualities that are ordinarily regarded as essential to national continuity and imperial expansion. Numerically it is comparatively small, and it possesses neither outstanding military nor political genius. Every strong nation has trampled upon and sought to exploit this race. Medes, Persians, Syrians, Egyptians, Babylonians, and Romans have endeavoured to crush and even exterminate the Jewish race, and still the persecution goes on. Ruthless and brutal attempts have been made to destroy its sanctuaries and to extinguish its traditions.

For well-nigh twenty centuries this race has survived its persecutors and retains distinguishing features that neither time nor changing circumstances have effaced. And why? Because under the guidance of God, Moses laid down laws and principles that have proved the indestructible foundation for an enduring race. The exile of Egypt becomes the Master of Egypt's Monarch. Pharaoh yielded to him who saw the King Invisible and never flinched. And, when Moses had left Egypt for ever behind him, he continued steadfast, enduring contradiction and reproach. His restraint and self-control place his name first on the roll of the meek who inherit the earth. Human tempests will surge around him, prejudice and jealousy will shoot envenomed fangs at the gracious benefactor, vile insinuations will be released to undermine his leadership, the sensitive soul will feel the anguish and loneliness of being cruelly misjudged, but the secret of his endurance shall abide. For he is learning to live constantly with the King who called him into a partnership that, once established, can never be dissolved.

There is much to puzzle and bewilder men in their quest for personal and international good, but most of it becomes irrelevant when we take Christ in earnest. So great a soul as Albert Schweitzer, through years of honest quest, increasing toil and noble humanitarian service, tells us how at length he found peace and satisfaction. It was not in the music he loves, nor in philosophic thought of which he is an acknowledged leader, nor in theology which he taught; it was not even in missionary service that he found peace, but in Christ Himself. 'He comes to us as One unknown, without a name, as of old by the lakeside He came to those men who knew Him not. He speaks to us the same word, "Follow thou me," and sets us to the tasks which He has to fulfil in our time. He commands, and to those who obey him, whether they be wise or simple, He will reveal Himself in the toils, the conflicts, the suffering which they shall pass through in His fellowship, and, as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience who He is.'

Criticise religion if you will, but don't tell me that it is mere imagination that makes heroes like Albert Schweitzer. It is God that worketh in him! He endures, because he sees the Invisible.

But have we not gone flabby? Inclined in the realm of faith and morals to move along the path of least resistance? An American minister who does not dislike England has written that 'the Church of England is dead and knows it, and the Free Churches are dead but don't know it.' The latter case is worse even than the former, for to know anything is not to be quite dead! Any Philistine might have said something equally false about the Israelites in Egypt. Moses recognized the difficulty of eliciting from them a response to spiritual stimuli, but he fanned the smoking flax until it became freedom's flaming torch. And we are not without such elect souls to-day, such as Grenfell of Labrador, Viscount Cecil of the League of Nations —each writing his name among the immortals through loyalty to the King Invisible. With them is the multitude that none can number of noble folk whose names are not recorded in public records but are written in the Lamb's Book of Life. Parents enduring beautifully concealed privation in order to prepare their children for some high calling that they may have equipment for mind and body that shall make them robust men and women, rich in those things that misers cannot hoard and that money fain would buy. We know them, and their

faith in God makes them more than conquerors. In quietness and confidence they find strength. They know nothing of hysteria and panic, for they have learned how the King Invisible enters when doors are shut, and opens others through which they pass into new regions of opportunity.

In Him they live and move and have their being. Their language is not sanctimonious, but living religion makes their lives strong and gladsome. The worldly-wise refuse to acknowledge them, yet they arrest the drift to disaster that threatens nations when godlessness claims authority. They stand for the principles that Moses enunciated, and these are valid to-day in every land whose citizens are wise enough to believe that the things which are seen are temporal while the things which are not seen are eternal.

Let us be rid of all platitude and formality as with perfect sincerity we frankly weigh Christ's philosophy of life with the blind materialism of our age. Philosophic materialism is dead and discredited, but materialism as a tendency is dominating life and action. Men are trusting too much in what they see and handle, yet the only powers capable of creating the atmosphere and conditions in which even material possessions can be enjoyed are invisible. Righteousness, conscience, duty, faith, hope and love do not appear. Yet, without these, the things for which the nations are selling their souls can never be secured. If life ends at the grave, it will end for most people long before the grave is reached. Nothing will save our visible world but a resurgence, and intelligent acceptance, of belief in the Invisible. As the sailor's safety depends more on his knowledge of the stars above him than of his knowledge of the dark waters around him, so our destiny, here and hereafter, depends on the goodness of God more than on the cleverness of man. The strength of this conviction in the mind of Moses saved Israel from relapsing into immoral worship of material and brute force when the Golden Calf was set up under the shadow of Mount Sinai. Had it not been for the superb moral endurance of her leader, Israel's future would have been past to-day, she would have been absorbed into the low tribal life of the surrounding peoples whose gods were of the earth, earthy. The fabric of Moses' enduring vision never became tattered. It had been woven on the loom of loyalty to the King Invisible, and therefore resisted the wildest winds and defied the stormiest blasts of raging storms. Faith in Jehovah overcame any temptation to accept the ease of the palace, and gave courage to perform the part of elder brother to unlovely, repulsive slaves, whose very souls had become parched and utterly unresponsive to any upward and forward call. Moses knew no servitude because he was the servant of God. In God's will he found peace. The secret of his endurance may be ours.

> Hardest servitude has he
> That's jailed in arrogant liberty;
> And freedom, spacious and unflawed
> Who is walled about with God.[1]

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A New Consecration.

BY THE REVEREND J. GRANT FLEMING, D.S.O., M.C., T.D., M.A., ABERDEEN.

'O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.'—Mt 26^{39}.

It has been said by someone that the first casualty in war is Truth. It does not require much insight to realize how true that saying is. The German propaganda machine has provided us with many examples; it has apparently taken a leaf out of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*—the bigger the lie the better ally it makes. Even in our own country Truth suffers at the hands of foolish rumour-mongers. She is indeed war's first casualty.

I would cap that saying with another: 'The first conscript in war is God.' As soon as war in all its horror descends upon us, the name of God is on the lips of many who gave little thought to Him in time of peace. Cabinet Ministers, politicians, soldiers, leaders in every walk of life and in every nation, newspapers, speeches, all invoke the name of God, beseeching Him for victory. Men and women who feel the burden of the tragic days in which we live breathe a prayer to God for the safety of themselves and dear ones. At the request of a King a whole nation turns out to pray on one special Sunday—to pray for deliverance and victory, and thousands of these same people will blame God if things go wrong. Some are doing it already. Have you not heard them? 'Why does God allow the awful horror of war—why does He permit the slaughter of the innocent?' If He is not conscripted to do things they have not much time for Him.

I should think it fairly safe to say that fifty per cent. of the folk who have conscripted God for the duration gave Him little thought in the safer times of peace. There is a meanness about this return to religion in days when we are up against it that must make the cynic laugh. 'O God, we scarcely thought

[1] W. E. Blackburn, *Christ Shows the Way*, 128.

about religion when things were going well and we did not seem to need you, but now death to Nation and Empire, to ourselves and our loved ones, confronts us—to prayer! to prayer, friends, lest all be lost!'

But what is perhaps still more foolish is that we are thorough in our conscription of the Almighty. Not only do we conscript Him to hear our prayers and expect an answer, we clothe Him in khaki and put a weapon in His hands. He is the Omnipotent Leader who, despite the sin of our own unpreparedness, will stop the onslaught of the enemy and lead us to victory. Repentance, the desire for forgiveness, the grace of re-dedication are not so apparent as they ought to be—if they were more so, there might be some hope for us. But no, like many another conscript in the army these days, God has to bear the brunt of our mistakes and, without any real preparation on our part, has to save us and lead us to victory. This may sound almost blasphemous, but it is true. God is conscripted all right—conscripted for the duration.

And quite rightly so—I am sure God agrees. The God who, in Christ, could bear the anguish of betrayal by His own disciples, who suffered the indignities of trial, mockery, and scourging, who willingly went to a Cross that the world might be saved, will bear this further indignity if, as the result of these prayers in time of crisis, some of the thoughtless are halted and made to think, if some in the valley of the shadow find the help they so sorely need, if some in their sorrow and loss find the saving comfort of a God who cares. Yes, God is a willing conscript. What a blessed mercy He is!

I believe that God whom Christ taught us to call Father—God who has borne with His wayward children so long, will hear us and answer our cry—will save us. Of course it is right to turn to God in our extremity—to whom else can we go? He is a forgiving God: He is a forbearing Father: He is patient and longsuffering: even the cry of the prodigal finds a response in the waiting Father's heart—no, it is not wrong to turn in our need, our failure, our loss, our sorrow, our unpreparedness, to God the Father—God will hear and will save. Yes, we are right to cry to God in our dire need. It is right to cry to God in crisis; it is right to believe that if our cause is just, God will lead us to victory; it is right of our leaders to call the people to prayer. But there is still something wrong, and what is wrong is seen in the comparison most of us can make between an ordinary Sunday and the Call to Prayer Sunday.

Then the Churches were full of praying people. To-day, and any other Sunday, methinks, they are not so full. That suggests that God is being made a slave rather than a conscript, and that our prayers were not the cry of men and women realizing their dire need, but the babblings of a people still in the darkness of superstition. Men don't believe sufficiently to really pray, but there may be something in it, so they take a chance. A day of prayer may do some good, so it was worth trying anyway. Either that Sunday for many folk was a fetish rather than an act of faith, or we are not awake to the tragedy that threatens us—not sufficiently awake as a Nation to carry on praying. Or perhaps it is that as a people we have much to learn about prayer—that prayer is not a thing of words for one special Sunday but a waiting upon God for every day. Prayer is not the giving of oneself occasionally, but a giving of oneself all the time.

You will agree with me when you think of the difference between to-day and the Sunday of the Call to Prayer that we have much to learn about God and prayer and ourselves. We have conscripted God to fight for us, but we are expecting Him to lead us to victory with only half our forces mobilized. Even if He does hear our cry we are failing Him just as surely as we have failed those conscripts who have been sent into battle without sufficient tanks and aeroplanes. If the Nation thinks it has done something by one day's praying it has been blinded by a fetish, and we have failed to face reality.

There is much that is wrong. I sometimes wonder what the issue of these days will be. But in times like these it is not much use crying over lost opportunities, lamenting too much over mistakes that can yet be put right. Mistakes have been made in many ways in this war—in preparation for trial, in the conduct of operations, in the supply of munitions, about the security of defences—but those who now have the control of affairs politically and in the Services have no time to weep over things that have gone wrong—they are striving all they can to put them right and achieving noble success. I lift my hat to some of the men who are at the helm now. If you could see them striving, grappling with the situation as I see them you would take heart.

It is perhaps unkind of me to bring these thoughts before you who are regular in attendance at church, for you, at least, have not gone back on the vows you purposed in your hearts that Sunday of Prayer. But I speak like this because, by reason of your fidelity and conviction and witness you must be leaders in putting things right, you must work like

those who have taken on the burden of reorganizing things in this country, in striving to bring others to see the error of their ways, in lifting aloft the banner that will lead to victory—the banner of a God who is willingly with us, willingly conscripted with us in this righteous cause.

There is still time for new consecration; prayer that can be effective is still ours to use. Pray then—work, witness, have faith—lead!

One night in Gethsemane, the Son of God, Himself, prayed: 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me.' This is our prayer in these anxious days: 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from us.' That was our prayer on the Sunday of the Call to Prayer. But almost as certainly as in Christ's case, it will not pass. The Prime Minister told us the other day that he had nothing to offer but sweat, tears and sacrifice. When we come to the Table of our Lord we are reminded that like Christ we have to face the Cross, that we must prepare ourselves to do so. Suffering, sorrow, loss, is already being borne by many—all of us must be ready to travel the valley of the shadow in these dark days. Forgive me being so gloomy, but our leaders are at last alive to the fact that the truth must be faced. But we do so not as those without hope, but as those who know that the cross on which Christ was crucified was not the end. Indeed it was the symbol of a great and glorious triumph. We do so as those who know that the way of the Cross is the way of Victory.

How fortunate we are who can come to the Table of our Lord. The cup which we take to our lips, the bread which we break, remind us that God does strengthen His servants for the hour of trial, that He does come to them in their need, to help them through.

Cynics and atheists have called our religion dope in days gone by. Dope—what have they got to help them in such critical times? Communion encourages us, gives us strength, reminds us that whatever comes, life or death, the issue is in God's hands and all is well, challenges us to go and bear our cross with Christ and fight bravely, assures us that the end must be triumph. After the prayer of that special Sunday that the cup might pass from us, let us make every Sunday a day of consecration, that we will do God's will, that our approach to God in prayer will be real and not make-believe, that our witness will be such that those who merely make God a slave will see that He is their Father, that those who are superstitious will come to know that prayer is a real preparation for battle. Let us gird ourselves and be done with past mistakes; let us face the difficult days with steady eyes, going on to every cross we may have to bear courageously. Let us close our prayer as Christ closed His: 'not as I will, but as thou wilt.'

In the leadership of our example and in our waiting upon God in consecration, Gethsemane and the Cross will be won through, and perhaps ere long our hopes will find realization in a resurrection morning—not only in a life to come but in a new world. A new day here on earth dawning for us.

The Danite Migration to Laish.

By Professor H. H. Rowley, M.A., D.D., B.Litt., Department of Semitic Languages, University College of North Wales.

In Judges 17–18 we have an account of the setting up of Micah's image, and the installation of a Levite to have charge of it, followed by the story of its subsequent transfer, together with its priest, to Laish when part of the tribe of Dan migrated from their southern home to that city, and occupied and renamed it. The story stands in the appendix to the Book of Judges, so that any attempt to discover its date is unhampered by the compiler's chronological framework. A parallel, but much shorter, account of this migration stands in Jos 19^{47}, where Leshem stands instead of Laish.

It is common to attempt a comparative dating on the basis of Jg 5^{17}, where the Massoretic text reads, 'Why did Dan sojourn in ships?' This involves, first, the determination of the approximate date of the victory of Deborah and Barak; and second, the determination as to whether the reference in the Song of Deborah is to the southern Dan or to the northern, and consequently as to whether the migration of Dan preceded the battle of Taanach

or followed it. On neither point is there anything like unanimity.

Albright earlier[1] dated the events celebrated in the Song of Deborah *circa* 1175 B.C., but more recently[2] proposes a date *circa* 1125 B.C. Wheeler Robinson[3] comes down still later to a date *circa* 1100 B.C., while Garstang[4] would push the date back beyond Albright's earlier date to *circa* 1200 B.C. T. H. Robinson[5] also places it earlier than the Philistine incursion into Palestine, and therefore before 1192 B.C.[6]

Against the view that Deborah must be placed after the Philistine entry, Albright[7] urges that in the Song (Jg 5^{6}) Shamgar ben-Anath is referred to as a precursor of Sisera, while in Jg 3^{31} we are told that Shamgar ben-Anath slew six hundred Philistines with an ox goad. *Prima facie*, this would seem to be the same person, and in the absence of any other information about him, we should accept this, and so place Deborah later than the Philistine invasion.

This argument is not very strong, since it is disputed whether Jg 3^{31} is in its original place, or whether it refers to the same person as Jg $5^{6.8}$. The latter reference would suggest that he was an oppressor, rather than a deliverer, and not a few writers have adopted this view in various forms. Albright has suggested that he drove off the Philistines when they first attempted to secure a foothold on the Palestinian seaboard,[9] but became an oppressor of the Israelites, and that after his death the hegemony of Galilee passed to Sisera of Harosheth.[10] Sellin supposes that Shamgar was the predecessor of Sisera in the city of Harosheth itself,[11] while Garstang, who equally denies that he was an Israelite 'judge,' identifies him with a Syrian sea-captain of the time of Rameses II.[12] To this Sir Charles Marston adds the further suggestion that *The Ox Goad* was the name of Shamgar's ship.[13] Yet another suggestion is followed by Graham and May, who think Sisera was himself a Philistine.[14] This rests partly on the strangeness of his name.[15] If this view could be convincingly established, it would be equally fatal against the view that Sisera was Shamgar's successor, unless the Shamgar of Jg 3^{31} and the Shamgar of Jg 5^{6} are differentiated, and against the view of T. H. Robinson that Deborah antedates the Philistine advent into Palestine. In truth, however, there is no solid foundation on which to base any of these views, and it is unwise to put much weight on the problematical Shamgar in determining the date of the battle of Taanach.

More important are the archæological considerations on which Albright relies.[16] He concludes from Jg 5^{19} that Megiddo itself was unoccupied at the time of the battle, since Taanach, nearly four miles from the stream, is named instead of Megiddo, which was but half a mile away. On archæological grounds one of the destructions of Megiddo, which was followed by a period of abandonment, is placed *circa* 1150 B.C., and since other periods of abandonment are either too early or too late, it is by reference to this that Albright dates the victory over Sisera.[17]

While I incline to allow rather more time than Albright for the events that lie between the time of Deborah and the destruction of Shiloh, I accept his date substantially, and believe the victory of Deborah and Barak over Sisera to have been won in the third quarter of the twelfth century B.C., but probably early in that quarter. This is in close agreement with the view expressed elsewhere by Albright,[18] where the date is given as *circa*

[1] JPOS, i. (1921) 56; ii. (1922) 82 n. Cf. Sellin, who dates them in the first half of the twelfth century B.C. (*Geschichte des Israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes*[2] (1935), 102).

[2] BASOR, lxii. (1936) 29; lxviii. (1937) 25.

[3] *The History of Israel : its Facts and Factors* (1938), 42.

[4] *Joshua-Judges* (1931), 298. So, also, Hall, *Ancient History of the Near East*[7] (1927), 413.

[5] *History of Israel*, i. (1932) 79.

[6] Robinson, in agreement with most writers, gives 1192 B.C. as the date of the Philistine immigration. But Albright (BASOR, lviii. (1935) 17 f.), basing himself on Borchardt's researches ('Einige astronomisch festgelegte Punkte zweiter Ordnung im Neuen Reiche' in *Zeitschrift fur Ägyptische Sprache*, lxx. (1934) 97–103), places it in 1188 B.C.

[7] JPOS, i. (1921) 55–62. Albright holds that Shamgar ben-Anath does not mean *Shamgar the son of Anath*, but *Shamgar of Beth Anath*, in northern Galilee (55 n.). Cf. Maisler, PEFQS, 1934, 192–4.

[8] Cf. Burney, *The Book of Judges* (1920), 75 ff. Maisler (*loc. cit.*) equates Jg 3^{31} with 2 S $23^{11f.}$ and identifies Shamgar with Shammah ben Agee.

[9] JPOS, i. (1921) 55, 60.

[10] *Ibid.* 61.

[11] *Op. cit.*, i. 102 f.

[12] *Joshua-Judges*, 287 f.

[13] *The Bible is True* (1934), 248; *The Bible Comes Alive* (1937), 163.

[14] *Culture and Conscience* (1936), 150.

[15] Albright (JPOS, i. (1921) 56) says Shamgar is a Hittite name, while Maisler (*loc. cit.*) holds that it is a Ḫurrian name.

[16] BASOR, lxii. (1936) 27 ff.; lxviii. (1937) 25.

[17] James (*Personalities of the Old Testament* (1939), 58 n.), while agreeing substantially with Albright's dating of the battle of Taanach, is not convinced that it was later than the fall of Megiddo.

[18] BASOR, lviii. (1935) 18.

1150 B.C. The latter date is also favoured by Kittel.[1]

When we turn to the second question, as to whether the Dan referred to in the Song of Deborah is the southern or the northern Dan, we find once more a division of opinion amongst scholars. Budde,[2] Moore,[3] Meyer,[4] Cooke,[5] Burney,[6] and Garstang[7] all find the reference to be to the northern Dan, while Bertheau,[8] Wellhausen,[9] G. A. Smith,[10] Zapletal,[11] T. H. Robinson[12] and Albright[13] find it to be to the southern Dan, and Peake[14] is uncertain which is intended.

The problem lies in the reference to ships. Garstang[15] improbably believes the reference to be to the boats on Lake Huleh, which is not far from the northern Dan, while others suppose the reference is to service by the Danites on Phœnician trading ships.[16] Moore rejects this idea,[17] and thinks the meaning is that Dan lived under the protection of sea-faring Phœnicians. This is to strain the text very far. The northern Dan was well inland, and maritime connexions are not very probable for a district whose distance from Sidon is emphasized (Jg $18^{7.\ 28}$), and whose fertility ($18^{9f.}$) would seem to have been sufficient to satisfy the newcomers for some time.

It is true that the northern Dan was neighbour to Asher, which is mentioned in the same verse in Jg 5^{17}. But little store can be set by this. For Gilead is mentioned in even closer association with Dan, in the same half of the verse. Verses $16f.$ name four tribes that failed to send assistance to Deborah and Barak. These were Reuben, Gilead (=Gad), Dan and Asher, all lying at some distance from the scene of the battle, two inland tribes on the east of the Jordan and two maritime tribes on the west. If these tribes west of the Jordan lay one to the north of the Canaanite belt controlled by Sisera, and one to the south of that belt, they would just as surely call for mention as if they both lay to the north.

Against the southern identification it is argued that it is very improbable that the tribe of Dan ever reached the sea in this district, since we are told in Jg 1^{34} that the Amorites would not suffer the Danites to descend to the coastal plain. But since the northern Dan certainly did not reach the sea, this argument would, if valid, tell equally against that identification. Moreover, Jos 19^{46} places the border of Dan close to Joppa. While it is doubtful if Dan ever secured effective control of Joppa, or of the sea-board, it would seem as if some effort was made to establish themselves there,[18] and Dan's maritime aspirations and experiences may be more appropriately referred to the south than to the north.

Budde earlier[19] proposed to read נְאוֹתָיו = *meadows*, for אֳנִיּוֹת = *ships*, in Jg 5,[17] but has since[20] abandoned this. It would be equally possible to read גֵּאָיוֹת = *valleys*, and so eliminate the difficult reference to ships altogether. This would be quite appropriate to describe the district occupied by the tribe.[21]

While recognizing the difficulty and uncertainty of the text, I am in agreement with Robinson and Albright that the southern settlement of Dan is referred to. I am not in agreement with them, however, in supposing that this means that the Song of Deborah antedates the migration of Danites to Laish. In the account of the migration it is not stated that the whole tribe trekked northwards, and it seems probable that it was but a part of the tribe that carried out the attack on Laish.[22] Nor

[1] *Geschichte des Volkes Israel,*[7] ii. (1925) 15. So also Graham and May, *op. cit.*, 150; James, *op. cit.*, 58.

[2] *Das Buch der Richter* (1897), 46.

[3] *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (1898), 115.

[4] *Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (1906), 525.

[5] *Judges* (Cambridge Bible) (1918), 63.

[6] *The Book of Judges* (1920), 143.

[7] *Joshua-Judges*, 247.

[8] *Das Buch der Richter und Rut* (1845), 95.

[9] *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (1885), 444.

[10] *Historical Geography of the Holy Land,*[22] 220.

[11] *Das Buch der Richter* (1923), 83.

[12] *History of Israel*, i. (1932) 79.

[13] BASOR, lxii. (1936) 27.

[14] Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, i. (1898) 548 b.

[15] *Joshua-Judges*, 305.

[16] Cf. Meyer, *op. cit.*, 525; Cooke, *op. cit.*, 63. So also Zapletal (*op. cit.*, 83), who, however, favours the view that the southern Danites are referred to. Nöldeke suggested that members of the tribe may have taken to fishing (cf. *Encyclopædia Biblica*, i. (1899) col. 993 n.).

[17] *Op. cit.*, 115.

[18] T. H. Robinson believes that Dan was a maritime tribe in pre-Philistine days (*History of Israel*, i. 128). So Albright, JPOS, ii. (1922) 82 n.; cf. i. (1921) 56.

[19] *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel* (1890), 16 n.

[20] *Das Buch der Richter* (1897), 46.

[21] Cf. G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 220: 'The territory, which the book of Joshua assigns to Dan, lies down the two parallel valleys that lead through the Shephelah to the sea, Ajalon and Sorek, and the Song of Deborah seems to imply that they reached the coast.'

[22] T. H. Robinson (*op. cit.* i. 143) assumes that the whole tribe migrated. But Kittel (*op. cit.* ii. 21, 42) doubts if the whole tribe was concerned in this episode. Cf. Hogg, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, i. (1899) col. 995;

is it suggested that they occupied more than this single township and its environs. The rest of the tribe remained in the southern home, and it continued to exist throughout the period of the Judges. From its ranks sprang Samson, who is probably to be placed after the migration.[1] It is true that in later times Dan ceased to figure amongst the tribes, but this is no more relevant evidence against a continuing Danite remnant in the south than against the establishment of a fresh Danite colony in the north. It simply means that the Danite elements, whether in the south or in the north, gradually became absorbed in their neighbours, until the tribe survived only in the name of a single town.

If, then, as would appear, part of the Danites remained in the south, though hemmed in, there would be nothing surprising in a reference to this southern Dan, in its original Palestinian location, appearing in a poem composed even after a colony had hived off to Laish. I therefore believe the reference to Dan in the Song of Deborah leaves entirely open the question of whether the migration took place before or after the defeat of Sisera at Taanach.

The migration is commonly connected with the Philistine entry into Palestine,[2] and T. H. Robinson uses this consideration to support his dating of the Exodus in the fifteenth century B.C.[3] He places the migration after the Song of Deborah, but argues that Dan cannot have been a maritime tribe after the Philistines landed in Palestine. The battle with Sisera is therefore thrust back far earlier than the date Albright assigns to it. Actually the Old Testament nowhere says that the migration of Dan was due to Philistine pressure. It attributes the Danite failure to establish themselves in the plain to the Amorites (Jg 1^{34}), while Jos 19^{47} says their border 'went out' from them, or, if we accept a probable emendation, 'was too strait for them.'[4]

It is most likely, however, that this migration was due, directly or indirectly, to the coming of the Philistines. For even if it came about through Amorite pressure on Dan, the Amorites may themselves have been feeling the pressure of the newcomers from over the sea.[5] I therefore agree once more with Robinson in assigning the migration of the Danites to a date later than the coming of the Philistines.

This does not mean, however, that it took place immediately after their advent into the land to which they gave their name. It was not until the eleventh century B.C. that they were pressing into the central district of Ephraim, and it would therefore appear to have taken them almost the whole of the twelfth century to establish themselves along the coastal plain.[6] The migration of a portion of the tribe of Dan, under their pressure, might therefore have taken place at almost any time in the twelfth century B.C.[7]

Zapletal, *op. cit.*, 267; Fernández, *Miscellanea Biblica* (Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici), i. (1934) 144 (=*Biblica*, xv. (1934) 264).

[1] Cf. Fernández, *Miscellanea Biblica*, 143 f. (=*Biblica*, xv. 263 f.). Maspero (*The Struggle of the Nations*,[2] Eng. Tr. reprinted 1925, p. 704) places Samson before the migration, as also do Olmstead (*History of Palestine and Syria* (1931) 272 ff.) and T. H. Robinson (*op. cit.* i. 156), but whereas Olmstead further places the migration before the battle of Taanach, Robinson places it after.

[2] So Maspero, *op. cit.*, 704; Lods, *Israël, des origines au milieu du VIIIe siècle* (1930), 390; Robinson, *op. cit.*, i. 157; Meek, *Hebrew Origins* (1936), 90; Albright in BASOR, lxii. (1936), 29.

[3] *Op. cit.*, i. 79, where he maintains that the consideration that the Danite migration was the consequence of the Philistine entry and that the Song of Deborah preceded that entry is decisive for the dating of the Exodus.

[4] וַיֵּצֵר (cf. LXX, *θλίβοντα*), for M.T. וַיֵּצֵא. So Noth in Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*,[3] (1936), but in *Das Buch Josua* (1938), 92, he says this change is unnecessary, and instead follows Eissfeldt (*Hexateuch-Synopse* (1922), 283*) in rendering 'ging ihnen verloren.' So also Schulz, *Das Buch Josua* (1924), 63. Eissfeldt justifies this rendering of M.T. by reference to 2 K 12^{13} and 1 K 10^{29}, neither of which seems quite parallel to the present text. Cf. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, ii. (1910) 55.

[5] So Lods, *Israël*, 390.

[6] Robinson assumes that the Philistines secured immediate control of the whole seaboard, so that Dan could not have been on the coast at any time after their arrival, and he is doubtful if Asher could have been on the coast (*op. cit.*, i. 78 f., and THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxvii. (1935–6) 54). Albright, however, observes that 'there is no proof that the southern part of the plain of Sharon, around Lydda and Jaffa, which is assigned in the lists of Joshua to Dan, was occupied by the Philistines until comparatively late in the period of the Judges, when they began to expand northward' (BASOR, lxii. (1936) 27). Cf. Ricciotti, who says that about 1100 B.C. the Philistines began their expansion and came into contact with the Israelites (*Storia d'Israele*,[2] i. (1934) 306, or French Tr. (1939), 315). S. A. Cook (*Notes on Old Testament History* (1907), 41) suggests that the migration of Dan did not take place till after the time of David.

[7] Cf. what I have said on this in *Israel's Sojourn in Egypt* (1938), 24.

We have one indication of the date, to which little attention seems to have been devoted. It is found in Jg 18^{30}, which states that Micah's priest, who was carried off by the migrating Danites, was Jonathan the son of Gershom, the son of Moses. The existing Massoretic text reads *Manasseh* for *Moses*, but the *nun* is suspended, and it is generally agreed that the reading *Moses* is to be preferred. This is found in the Vulgate, and it was declared by the Rabbis to be the true reading, altered for reasons of edification.[1] The great majority of exegetes and commentators have accepted this reading with confidence, and it is not seldom noted that this Mosaic descent of the priesthood of Dan would not have been preserved unless it was genuine.

The Levite whom Micah installed is said to have been a young man at the time of his installation as Micah's priest (Jg 17^{7}), but his age at the time of the Danite migration is quite unknown. For we have no means of estimating the interval between his installation as the custodian of his patron's image, and the seizure of image and priest by the Danites. All we can say is that the migration of the Danites is represented as having taken place within the lifetime of the grandson of Moses.

T. H. Robinson discounts the statement that this priest was the grandson of Moses by saying that the chronology is decisive against it.[2] But this means no more than that it is in disagreement with his dating of the Exodus in the fifteenth century B.C. He values the statement because of its connexion of the Danite priesthood with Moses, but supposes that Jonathan was a more distant descendant of Moses than grandson. For if the Exodus took place in the fifteenth century B.C., and the migration of the Danites took place after the Philistine invasion of Palestine, a period of more than two hundred years would be spanned by this genealogy, and since we are told that Gershom was born before the Exodus (Ex 2^{22}), many links must be supposed to have fallen out between Gershom and Jonathan.

This is to reduce the statement to insignificance, however. For if the genealogy was preserved because of its establishment of the Mosaic descent of the priest of Dan, it might reasonably have been expected to effect this establishment. But a leap over two centuries between one name and the next would destroy that establishment and annul the purpose. It is, of course, perfectly true that in Hebrew *son* can stand for a more distant descendant, but in a genealogy intended to establish the descent of Jonathan from Moses, the intermediate names would surely have been recorded, had they been known, and if they were not known, the evidence becomes completely hollow.[3]

In any case the Hebrew could perfectly naturally mean that Jonathan was the grandson of Moses, and the late date view of the Exodus under Moses has no need to import a gap into this genealogy. If the Exodus took place in the latter part of the thirteenth century B.C., and if Moses' son was born before the Exodus, the life of his grandson could fall almost wholly, or even wholly, within the twelfth century B.C., and hence would cover the period of the first pressure of the Philistines upon Dan.

I have elsewhere drawn attention to the curious fact that the genealogies of the Old Testament are almost invariably in disagreement with the chronology, in so far as the period from the descent into Egypt to the dedication of Solomon's temple is concerned, and I have observed that it is antecedently probable that the genealogies would preserve a truer indication of time than the chronology, since long periods are extraordinarily difficult to compute where there is no fixed era.[4] I did not there note this genealogy of Jonathan, which provides its further measure of support to the late date view of the Exodus under Moses.

It is not necessary, of course, to place the original settlement of Dan in the south in the post-Mosaic age, or to suppose that Dan first attempted to establish itself there at the time when the Philistines were already settling on the coast in the south of Palestine. It is commonly held that all the Israelite tribes did not enter the land together, and that the Danites belonged to the pre-Mosaic wave of immigration. I have elsewhere advanced the view that this earlier wave of immigration, which comprised movements into both the north and the south of Palestine, took place in the Amarna period in the first half of the fourteenth century B.C., and that it was contemporaneous with the descent of other Israelite elements into Egypt.[5] I have there suggested that the tribe of Levi belonged to the southern

[1] Cf. T. B. *Baba Bathra*, 109 b. Cf. also Burney, *Judges*, 434 f

[2] *History of Israel*, i. 156 n.

[3] Cf. Fernández, *Miscellanea Biblica*, 143 (=*Biblica*, xv. 263): 'Pero, como Gersom era ciertamente hijo immediato de Moisés, como se desprende de Ex. 2, 22; 18, 3, parece natural que en el mismo sentido interpretemos la voz, cuando se trata de la filiación de Jonatán respecto de Gersom.'

[4] *Israel's Sojourn in Egypt*, 4 ff.

[5] *Israel's Sojourn in Egypt* (1938), and 'The Eisodus and the Exodus' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, L. (1938–9) 503–8.

movement of the earlier immigration, and reached the Shechem district, but failed to establish itself there, whereupon some of its elements fell back with Simeon on Judah, but instead of being absorbed in Judah, as Simeon was, gradually took on a functional character in the priesthood, while other elements went into Egypt to join the kindred group that had gone thither, from whom they had but recently separated. The fact that Kenites were associated with the southern movement into Palestine, and therefore with the tribe of Levi, would explain why Moses fled from Egypt to a Kenite settlement, with which he might have had connexions on his mother's side. I may add that this view would also explain why Moses' grandson should be found at Bethlehem-Judah (Jg 17^{7}). If some of the Levites fell back from the Shechem district on Judah when others went down to Egypt, Moses may well have had some connexions at Bethlehem-Judah, to whom his grandson could naturally go. For the stories of Isaac and Jacob bear testimony to the fact that the maintenance of ties of blood, even with those separated by great distances, was normal in early Hebrew practice.

Christianity and Civilization.

By Professor John M. Graham, M.A., Aberdeen.

Throughout the nineteenth century, and, roughly speaking, up to the end of the third decade of the present century, the Christian Church wrestled with the problem of integrating religion with the new forces of civilization and culture. Broadly speaking, the problem was how to relate religion and science in an harmonious partnership. It had two sides, theoretical and practical. The new world-view emerging from the sciences had to be integrated with the essential faith of the Church. And the new relationships between men and nations which followed the applications of science to practical life had to be controlled and moulded in accordance with Christian conceptions in ethics. Liberal theology accepted these tasks. Has it failed? Was it wrong to accept them?

The most characteristic theological writing of this last decade answers, Yes! We hear that Christianity is and must always be the faith of a minority; that civilization is essentially the assertion of man's self-sufficiency and pride; that Liberal Protestantism sold its birthright for a mess of pottage in seeking to become a philosophy, making appeal to the reason; that the breakdown of our civilization is a proof of all this. Many of us in our writing and preaching have found a gloomy and almost complacent satisfaction in what appears to be a striking historical vindication of a doctrine that the world had despised as cant—the doctrine of sin, even of *original* sin. We have almost said, 'I told you so. The external chaos of our times is the reflection and result of an internal chaos which is natural to man. Man is a sinner. The higher he climbs, the harder he falls. His greatest achievements are in the end his greatest occasions of self-delusion and failure.'

The tendency to which I refer in these general terms may be illustrated more particularly. One might mention the influential book, *The Christian Message in a non-Christian World*, by Hendrik Kraemer. In a more recent publication by a British writer, a booklet entitled *The Church and the Peace*, Mr. D. R. Davies argues that the Church must indeed strive to achieve after this war a good peace. For when this peace breaks down, as it will, in further strife and confusion, the disillusionment of man with himself will be so complete, that there is some hope that man will then be forced to acknowledge himself a helpless sinner, and return humbly to God. The meaning of history thus becomes paradoxically the process by which it demonstrates its meaninglessness, and forces man to accept a transcendental relationship with God as his salvation, a salvation from the corruption and futility of terrestrial life.

This frankly other-worldly emphasis in religion is not merely perverse. It contains a great deal of wholesome criticism of the superficial idealisms that have masqueraded as Christianity in the period of expansion of Western civilization. Yet one may seriously doubt its value when it claims to be more than a recovered emphasis, and presents itself as a guide to men in their present confusions. The movement of thought from the actual and manifest evils of our civilization to a doctrine of total depravity of human nature and human history is not made by a logical compulsion. Most men would not

accept the conclusion, even when they give full weight to the premises. They would be inclined to say that for their part they find themselves the victims of circumstances which they could not control, and for which they cannot feel themselves responsible. They would argue that so far as evil-doing is responsible for our disasters (as opposed to stupidity or ignorance) it can largely be localized. The responsibility belongs primarily to those who have had the power to influence events in a big way, rulers and owners of wealth, men of ability and influence, the leaders of churches. The task of Christians is not to swamp all relative moral distinctions in a generalized confession of sin or a generalized despair of human achievement, but to 'trust in God and do the right,' to hold through thick and thin to the reality and power of ideal values, and to affirm again in thought and life the purposes and principles by which human life is dignified and God is glorified in this present world.

One characteristic feature of the trend of Christian thought to which I refer is its re-interpretation of modern history. It has become customary to set the Reformation and the Renaissance in opposition to each other. The latter was an assertion of man's self-sufficiency and independence of God—the former a rediscovery of man's utter dependence on Him. The Church, we are told, must be summoned back to the 'biblical theology' of Luther and Calvin, and must repudiate the 'humanism' of the secular movement that ran side by side with the Reformation, intermingled with it, and in the end corrupted it in the era of Liberal Protestantism. It is acknowledged, of course, that the Renaissance and the Enlightenment assisted the necessary destructive work of the Reformation; but its co-operation with Protestantism was very much like the co-operation of Communists with Liberal democracy, a temporary expedient, the accident of a particular phase of history. Thereafter it proceeded to destroy Protestantism from without and within, and to produce modern secular atheism. It destroyed Protestantism by imposing its this-worldly hopes on the Church, by diverting its energies to mere social amelioration, by enmeshing its theologians in the fine webs of rationalist philosophy. Not only does Descartes with his *Cogito ergo sum* become the deifier of man, but Immanuel Kant himself a subtler kind of atheist.

Such is one picture of our modern period. And here is another. Protestantism joined at the Reformation with humanism in setting men free from effete and tyrannous intellectual and social traditions. But it imposed new shackles on men—an authoritative Bible and dogma, a narrow individualistic ethic, a subjective and introspective psychology. It unfitted man for his modern experience by estranging science, by failing to understand the social nature of man, by underestimating the importance of the material basis of human life. Its thinking has been defensive and timid, its social effort has been mere ambulance work, dealing with effects and leaving causes of evil largely untouched. It has been concerned too much with subjective states and too little with objective welfare. It has identified itself with elements of civilization that have largely exhausted their significance, and failed to enter into creative co-operation with the new significant elements of civilization.

Which picture is truer? The late Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, in his great History of Europe, professes to find no pattern or purpose in the confused good and evil of history. Certainly all simple patterns turn out in the end to be too simple. They are, in fact, not found in events but imposed upon them. This is surely true of the patterns just described for the modern period. Both are true, and both are fantastically false. Good and evil, truth and error, mix together in these great movements of the spirit of man. The attempt to dramatize history is a precarious business. To return to Mr. D. R. Davies: let us suppose his highest hopes fulfilled, and a just and generous peace concluded; and let us suppose also his worst fears realized—a ruinous collapse of the new structure of civilization. He hopes that the resulting disillusionment of man with himself will drive him to God.

But is it really possible for men to take up the movement of history into their personal experiences in this way? Can men make the history of Europe their own history? Is a man the microcosm of *Man*?

I am not contending that the history of a nation or culture has anything but the deepest significance for the individuals who compose it. Disaster overtaking a civilization cannot but bring misery and heart-searching to many, and the overt calamity of his society may indeed bring home to a man the elements making for calamity in his own life. But what I plead for is the effort to discriminate between good and evil concretely, instead of offering dramatic eschatologies and sweeping metaphors of Judgment, the effort to discern patiently the immanent Divine life in the world. Let us not depart incontinently from what was sound in the Liberal tradition, while we allow the experiences of disillusionment to deepen and purge it, and learn from the theology which has

emerged from the period of disintegration and collapse.

I have described Liberalism in theology at the beginning of this article as the attempt to achieve an integration of Christianity and civilization—specifically as an attempt to relate science, as theory and technology, to the Christian way of thought and life. Liberalism has been attacked in recent years as an attempt to accommodate Christianity to 'man-made' conceptions and values—a willingness to remove from the gospel its note of 'offence.' The opposite danger is as real; I mean the danger of developing a *minority complex*, of thinking of being cut off from the common life and thought of man as in itself a sign of grace. Minorities, as we know, have contributed enormously to the enlightenment and well-being of mankind. But only when they aimed at becoming majorities—when they sought to make effective contact with the mind of the majority. When minorities take satisfaction in their minority position they succeed in the end in cutting themselves off from the vitality of the larger natural life of man, and sooner or later they atrophy and die. In its revolt from Liberalism the Church is in danger of retreating within itself; monasticism is not necessarily a matter of physically enclosed communities devoting themselves exclusively to religion. A mental monasticism, raising unseen barriers against the world, is also possible. And both sorts are dangerous. Christianity aims at universality; it is creative only when it enters into manifold relation with common human life. Our faith can demonstrate its claims only by displaying a real mastery of life and thought as a whole. *Christianity must strive to become or to inspire a civilization, and not merely to be a church.* It was not wrong for Christianity to aim at being a philosophy; it was not wrong for Christianity to identify itself institutionally with national life; it was not wrong for the Church to initiate and sustain pioneer philanthropies, or promote social reforms. The Christian faith lives as the deeper meaning of common life, and not as a transcendental relationship apart from common life. It is in and through nature and society that we enter into relationship with God who transcends both. In the language of H. H. Farmer, the world is the 'intrinsic symbol' of God, by which he means that it is 'continuous with, and sustained by, the reality which it mediates.'[1] Our knowledge of God is not mediated to us exclusively by Bible, Church, Sacraments, but in the relations of secular life also.

We have spoken of this as a period of disintegration of civilization. But this describes only one aspect of the total situation. We must not allow ourselves to develop a psychology of decline or defeat. For, on the other side, the shaking and breaking of the old order is an opportunity. Christians must not, surely, echo the cynicism of those who discount the brave promises of a 'new order' held out by statesmen, as emerging from the war. We may not believe in the capacity of some of these statesmen to lead us into a new order, but it is treason to our faith to think that men will inevitably relapse into old and evil ways. Under the disorder there are emerging the conditions that make possible for the first time in history a *planetary* civilization. Can it be a Christian civilization?

In a recent book by T. S. Eliot, called *The Idea of a Christian Society*, the author sketches the 'skeleton' of such a society as might be called Christian. He makes use of the following working distinctions—Christian Community, Christian State, Community of Christians.[2]

Christian Community.—Mr. Eliot points out that for most men and women their Christianity is realized only, or mainly, in the form of behaviour. They are not capable of a highly conscious religious life. They are inarticulate, unoriginal. Their highest life is a response, and a response in action, to the more original conscious inspiration of others.[3]

The religion of the Christian Community can be expressed effectively only in a society where religious and social life form a natural whole, where the difficulty of behaving as Christians 'does not impose an intolerable strain.' These conditions are, of course, far from being realized to-day, even in peace-time. Their realization requires modification, or rather radical transformation, of industrial and political institutions. These must be made Christian in the sense that they form a suitable frame for Christian behaviour. Hence the urgent duty of concrete political and economic thought and action based on Christian assumptions and aims.

The Christian State.—Within such a framework the Christian State would operate as the legislative, administrative, and judicial organ of the society. Rulers would not necessarily be saints or eminent Christians, but men of the necessary ability and

[1] See *The World and God* (Nisbet), 58 and ch. iv.

[2] *The Idea of a Christian Society* (Faber & Faber), ch. ii. 25 ff.

[3] These correspond, roughly, I think, to the once-born category of William James, and are described very sympathetically by W. M. Macgregor in an essay 'The Religion of a Good Moderate,' in his masterly little volume *Persons and Ideals* (T. & T. Clark).

ambition who had received a Christian education, and were accustomed to refer their actions to Christian standards and to think in Christian categories.[1]

The Community of Christians.—Necessary to such a Christian society would be the Community of Christians. 'These will be the consciously and thoughtfully practising Christians, especially those of spiritual and intellectual superiority.' They would not be an organized body, but as clergy, teachers, writers, artists, scientists, philosophers, their business would be the creation and maintenance of a Christian education and culture.

I have done no more than sketch what Mr. Eliot himself describes as a sketch of the main essential elements in a Christian society. But I should like further to quote some sentences indicating the general point of view from which he approaches his subject. 'The tendency of totalitarianism is to reaffirm, on a lower level, the religious-social nature of society.' 'The choice before us is between the formation of a new Christian culture, and the acceptance of a pagan one. Both involve radical changes, but I believe that the majority of us, if we could be faced immediately with all the changes which will only be accomplished in several generations, would prefer Christianity.'

It is not insignificant, that in taking up the present military struggle, the claim has been made frequently by statesmen that we are defending Christian civilization. The National Day of Prayer called out to divine worship many who do not normally attend Church, and probably do not have real strength of Christian belief. This indicates, I think, that there is a real opportunity for Christian leadership to rally behind it a vast amount of brilliant human capacity and devotion, not explicitly Christian, in a sincere and serious effort to build a Christian civilization, in the sense indicated.

The Christian Church must not turn away from its civilizing mission, to cherish an isolated 'purity' of spiritual life of its own. It should now take up that task with fresh energy and devotion, seeking to enter more fully into the intellectual and social life of our time, aiming at the integration of thought and life round a Christian centre, unafraid to co-operate now in immediate tasks with all who will co-operate. This has implications of the most varied and extensive kinds. A few may be mentioned, with the hope that some may be dealt with by others in these pages.

(1) We must persist, in spite of current theological fashions, in the attempt to state a Christian philosophy that will prove adequate to the modern mind, formed as it is so much by the sciences, physical, social, and biological.

(2) We must persist in the ungrateful task of political *thinking and action,* accustoming ourselves more and more to the idea of 'mixing our politics and our religion.'[2]

(3) We must maintain and maximize, in our Christian missions abroad, their 'secular' expressions in education, medicine, and social work, and tap wider resources of men and money to improve them.

(4) We must revise our education, from elementary school to university, and including not least our theological faculties and colleges, to get away from mere instruction, and bring the unity of a religious faith and philosophy and life into clearer articulation in what we teach and in how we teach it. In regard to theological training, more must be done to bring the clergy into living relation with the living elements of our culture, and so enable them to give better guidance to their people for creative participation in the life of the secular community.

(5) We must reform our religious institutions to bring out more clearly their essential functions, and fit them for the changed habits and conditions of the present and the future.

[1] 'What the rulers believed,' says Eliot, 'would be less important than the beliefs to which they felt obliged to conform. And a sceptical or indifferent statesman, working within a Christian frame, might be more effective than a devout Christian statesman, obliged to conform to a secular frame. For he would be obliged to design his policy for the government of a Christian society,' 28.

[2] May I recommend a Penguin book by Sir Richard Acland, M.P., with the unhappy title *Unser Kampf*?

A Letter to a Young Man entering on his Ministry who is perplexed by 'Pacifism.'[1]

My Dear X,

You ask me to say something on 'Pacifism.' You know well the arguments that 'Pacifists' use, for the 'Pacifist' societies regard theological students as easy subjects for their propaganda, and the Peace Group in your college made you familiar with their literature. You yourself, you tell me, used to feel that as a Christian you had to be a 'Pacifist.' But now that you realize what a Nazi victory would mean, you are beginning to doubt your 'Pacifism' and yet still feel that as a Christian you cannot give support to war.

As your old teacher, I cannot refuse your request. Yet I should hate to appear as an advocate of war. I loathe war and regard it as the greatest of all evils, save the still worse evil of subjection to cruel tyranny. Perhaps I have failed in my duty in not speaking out more plainly against the 'Pacifist' position. I try as far as possible to avoid strife with my brethren, and when this issue has been debated at our denominational assemblies, those of us who felt that the issue was far more complex than the 'Pacifists' would recognize have been reluctant to intervene, knowing that, if we did so, we should be denounced as traitors to Christianity by those whose advocacy of peace does not obviously spring from a peaceable spirit.

Besides, the problem of war cannot be rightly treated in isolation, nor can it be solved merely by reference to the Sermon on the Mount. You will remember Brunner's treatment of the whole moral significance of Christianity in *The Divine Imperative*. Christianity gives us but one command—the command to love. What that love is we know to its fullness only in the Cross of Christ, and that command we have to obey as best we can within the 'orders' of sex, industry, and the State. All these 'orders' or 'ordinances' are of God's appointment, and yet we know them not as God wills them to be, but as perverted by the race's sin. Thus the State, as we know it, even in so humane a democracy as ours, bears on it the signs of sin. It is a divine 'order,' but an order corrupted by our corporate sin. Yet sin-stained as is the State, the individualism of the Manchester School is obviously impossible to-day. The State to-day has a paternal function and provides services we now see to be indispensable for the well-being of the community. Yet increasingly humane as are the activities of the State to which we ourselves belong, it depends and must depend on force. You will be getting your first income-tax assessment. You will not be able, as a good Scot is said to have done, to return it with a note that you 'do not propose to join this society!'

One of the difficulties of discussing the 'Pacifist' position is that its advocates employ so many different arguments. Thus Professor G. H. C. Macgregor, whom to know is to honour, in his *The New Testament Basis of Pacifism* denies that the Christian 'Pacifist' position is based on 'the repudiation of all use of force in the dealings of man with man either as individuals or as unity in the community,' and speaks of 'the absurdity of that position.' Yet this position to whose 'absurdity' Professor Macgregor refers is precisely that of some very gifted 'Pacifists' whom I have known. They said that all force was wrong, and held, for instance, that no Christian could serve in the Indian Civil Service, for he might have to employ force to put down rioting. That position means sheer anarchy, and involves the denial that the community or State is a divine 'order.' Force is in itself morally neutral. It is the purpose for which it is used that determines its moral value. The functions of the Church and of the State are different. Christian men may have as their vocation that of the judge, the prison-governor or the policeman. No State is fulfilling its true function unless it protects the innocent and restrains the violent. The duel has gone and private citizens do not carry arms, not because the use of force in itself is held to be wrong, but because the State, if necessary, uses force to secure justice. And war, too, will become obsolete only when justice has behind it needed strength. As Mr. F. L. Lucas has said, 'We shall never have peace till all the peaceable are prepared to fight side by side to the death for peace.'

[1] Dr. Cave, Principal of New College, London, and Professor of Theology in the University of London, was asked by his students to speak to them on the problem of war on which they had heard much from the representatives of 'Pacifist' societies. He did so on the lines of this paper. They were much influenced, and the editors of this magazine are publishing the talk, believing it will be of use to other young men and women.

But all this you may say is merely worldly wisdom. What of the arguments the 'Pacifists' use to show that no Christian can engage in war? It would be easier to answer these if they were less numerous and more consistent. You know the Old Testament too well to be impressed by the argument that God said, 'Thou shalt not kill.' Whatever view we hold of the Old Testament, it is clear that it does not prohibit war. Cain is blamed for killing Abel, but David is not blamed for killing Goliath. Our Lord's application of the command of love to the case of enemies can, with whatever difficulty, be obeyed in war. We think, for instance, of British sailors off the coast of Norway diving into the icy sea to rescue Germans who had been trying to torpedo their ship.

Or again, I have heard men say, as you will have done, 'Can you picture Christ using the bayonet?' Of course I cannot. His sole vocation was to be the Saviour of the world. That vocation could not be combined with that of a soldier. There are other vocations also with which it could not be combined. He could not have been a husband and father. I hear that you are hoping to get married soon, so you evidently do not feel that any vocation is wrong which was impossible for Christ.

The Christian gospel must make war abhorrent to us, and make us long for its abolition. But war is not one of the issues with which the New Testament directly deals. The Jews whom our Lord addressed were under the Roman peace; they were not, as we are, voting members of a democracy. Our Lord's words, being addressed in the first instance to His hearers, do not deal directly with the political problems which perplex us. We think, for instance, of the Parable of the Good Samaritan. I will leave you to name the counterparts to-day of the Priest and Levite who were content to pass by on the other side, touching no wounds and pleased that their hands were thus kept clean. The Red Cross Organization or the Friends' Ambulances surely share in the praise the Good Samaritan received. But the parable was not addressed to those responsible for good government. Are we wrong if we think that if there be a road infested by brigands, admirable and necessary as are the services of the Good Samaritans, no less necessary is that of those who will clear the road permanently of highwaymen? The use of force to suppress injustice is not the function of the Christian Church, but it is the function of a good government. You remember how St. Paul speaks of the ruler as 'a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil.' 'Wrath,' as you know, denotes for Paul the retributive order of the world. 'Wrath' and 'Law' are not the full expressions of the character of God. That can perfectly be seen only in the holy love of Christ's Cross. But, though retribution is for God not an end, it is a means. The State can never be a Church. The State is the sphere of retribution, and has justice for its first concern. Christ's Kingdom, as He Himself said, 'is not of this world.' And He added, 'If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight.' There are the two kingdoms, and the tension and tragedy of our present life is that we belong to both.

These two spheres, though they interpenetrate, cannot be identified. It is this that makes so much 'Pacifist' propaganda seem irrelevant. 'Pacifists' speak as if Christians belonged only to the Church or as if the State could be a Church. Thus Mr. Leyton Richards writes, 'The real alternative to the military way is the missionary way.' That is to confuse the function of the Church and of the State. The State can never be missionary. A missionary has for his vocation the proclamation of the gospel. However dangerous be his situation, he has no right to be armed, unless he live in a country where arms are necessary against the attacks of lions or tigers! It is not his business to defend himself or his converts. But if a man be not a missionary but a Government official entrusted with rule, it is his task to protect the innocent even though that involves the use of force.

Many 'Pacifists' I know rely not on specific arguments but on the general principle that for the Christian love is all sufficient. Much depends on what is meant by love, and that involves our whole interpretation of the gospel. How surprised the writers of the New Testament, for instance, would have been had they been told that, as Canon H. R. L. Sheppard put it, Christianity means 'Christ's views about God and the Sermon on the Mount.' Even that Sermon speaks of retribution, whilst the writers of the New Testament were not concerned with 'views about God.' Their proclamation, their *kerugma*, was of God's mighty acts in Christ. That coming of Christ had for its purpose salvation, yet, for those who rejected Him, it meant judgment. As the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen makes clear, when the Lord of the Vineyard sent His Son, that final act of grace brought about the catastrophe of judgment; the Son was killed and the husbandmen punished.

It is that note of judgment that we miss in much 'Pacifist' literature. Annas and Caiaphas were not better men for having met Jesus. Judas, one of

His disciples, betrayed Him. The Cross meant judgment for those that rejected Jesus, judgment for the Jewish nation, which caused Jesus to bid the daughters of Jerusalem sorrow not for Him but for themselves. The gift of the Church was a fresh provision of God's mercy for individuals, but the Jewish nation condemned itself when it rejected its Messiah.

Unconvincing as we find the arguments of Christian 'Pacifists,' we share with them to the full their horror of war. What shocks us is not that men should kill or be killed. If those that plot injustice alone suffered, we could be content sadly to leave them to their deserts. It is that war involves the suffering of the innocent, and on its present scale is almost the worst evil which can befall the world. We who lived through the last war did not need to be reminded of war's horrors, and some of us have prayed for peace as we have prayed for nothing else. We had hoped that the League of Nations would secure this. We knew, indeed, that Geneva was not the New Jerusalem, and that the polity of the League could not be identified with the Kingdom of God. It was a political method, and we may not put Christ's name on any political banner. But the League seemed the best political expedient to secure peace, and so it might have proved, had all peaceable people been ready to enforce its sanctions. It is strange to find 'Pacifists' condemning the League's failure to resist aggression. Peace cannot be secured unless the peaceful are stronger than the war-mongers. Those who pressed for unilateral disarmament and sought to get men to pledge themselves never to fight, ought not in fairness to blame statesmen for not resisting the breakers of the Covenant. Every peaceful nation in Europe deplored our premature disarmament. Had we been strong, the League might have secured peace. For its failure, 'Pacifist' agitation has a terrible responsibility. If you think that judgment too severe, read, if you have not yet, *Spiritual Values and World Affairs*, by Sir Alfred Zimmern, who is a Christian, but a Christian who, unlike you and me, has expert knowledge of foreign affairs. As he points out, 'Pacifists' had no right to pretend to be supporters of the League when they were 'its most dangerous opponents.' 'The object of the founders of the League was the effective prevention of war, and the heart of the Covenant is the obligation of mutual assistance between members of the League for their protection against attack.'

When Herr Hitler broke yet another promise and marched last year into Prague, it became impossible any longer to assert that he was merely trying to rectify the supposed injustices of the Treaty of Versailles. Yet, even since the war began, we have been told that we ought to be willing to make 'sacrifices' to avoid slaughter. But what sacrifices? The first sacrifices asked for would have been the surrender to his rule of the small countries he is cruelly oppressing and the giving up of colonies in Africa to one who describes Africans as 'half-apes,' existing only to be exploited.

It is not surprising that when you entered college you should have been a 'Pacifist.' At twenty, we see life in black and white, and in our self-confidence easily imagine that Christianity is the romantic following of our Hero Jesus. You are older now, and with age there comes to most men a greater realism. It is significant that as the age limits rise, a smaller proportion of men avail themselves of the easy way of the Peace Pledge Union to avoid the danger of military service, in spite of the fact that as many of the older men are married the sacrifice they make is greater. And in your college course you have gained a deeper knowledge of the world's sin and your own, and know now that the Christian gospel is different far from an idealism veneered with Christian phrases.

You tell me you are not now as convinced a 'Pacifist' as once you were. Do not let old associations get you into strange company. We have seen in this country how easily a 'Pacifist' movement can be utilized by German propagandists, and Norway and Holland show how tragic in its effect can be the association of honest 'Pacifists' and dishonest Fifth-columnists and Nazis.

When you go to your Church, you will go there as its Minister. I hope you will pray for the bereaved and suffering, not only of your own, but of all the warring lands. The members of your Church will differ on the grave issue of war. If 'Pacifist' meant what from its derivation it should mean, a 'peacemaker,' then every Christian would be a 'Pacifist.' We all hate war; we all desire the establishment of lasting peace. Don't speak as if so-called 'Pacifists' are the only lovers of peace, and by your arrogance and intolerance drive away from the Church all who differ from you. By now it is clear to all what Nazi domination would mean—the death for the time of all that honourable men hold dear. If our country is to endure to the end, it will be because, not only within but without the Churches, men and women believe that treachery and cruelty cannot be allowed to triumph. If you go humbly among your people you will be shamed by their courage from all priggishness and self-complacency.

It is not an easy time to begin your ministry. Yet, as you know, the gospel came to a cruel world, and nothing that men can do need rob us of our faith in God. This is not the time to wish men happiness. But I hope that you will have the satisfaction of bringing to the men and women you serve a confidence in God which nothing can destroy. And may this war soon so end that we all alike may be able to strive once more for lasting peace.

I am, my dear X,
Your old teacher,
Y.

Contributions and Comments.

Noli Me Tangere.

St. Jerome's translation of the words in the Fourth Gospel has been responsible, it would appear, for our English versions and in consequence, I venture to suggest, for a misunderstanding of our Lord's words.[1] In the N.T. ἅπτομαι constantly occurs in a sense almost interchangeable with that of κρατεῖν.[2] Allowing then for the exact significance of the present imperative in place of an aorist subjunctive, the meaning should be, 'Do not continue to keep hold of Me,' or 'do not seek to lay hold' or 'to cling to Me.' The following sentence then becomes clear. The Lord has not yet left the earth; He will be with His disciples for some time yet, so that Mary Magdalene need not fear that He will disappear, if she looses hold of Him. The time has not yet come for His ascension. It may be added that this appearance of our Lord to Mary Magdalene is to be identified with that to her and a companion recorded in the First Gospel. There it is said that the women clung to the Lord's feet, which is consistent with the Fourth Gospel's μή μου ἅπτου derived, we may suppose, from Mary Magdalene's individual story.[3]

T. Nicklin.

Ringwood, Hants.

[1] It is fair to say that *tangere* often means more than *touch*, θιγγάνειν ψηλαφᾶν. Thus *tetigit terram* is 'he reached, or made the shore.'

[2] Cf. Mt 8[15] ἥψατο and Mk 1[31] ἐκράτησεν.

[3] Westcott, as the Very Rev. R. O. P. Taylor has noted for me, mentions that a few copies here add that they started up and ran to Christ—perhaps to clasp His feet. This supports our identification of the appearance described by St. John with that described by St. Matthew. We shall understand the present ἀναβαίνω not as Westcott of a gradual ascension through the forty days, but as 'I am going to ascend,' in the same way that it occurs in 7[13].

Entre Nous.

'I Will Not Abandon You.'

How thrilled we all were some days ago when the news of the epic exploit of His Majesty's men of the Navy, Merchant Navy, Army, and Air Force, in the evacuation of the B.E.F. from Flanders, came through! As we pictured the men fighting their hazardous, precarious way to the coast at Dunkirk, fighting gallantly against terrific odds, how deeply stirred and moved we were!

I am sure one thought would have been in the minds of many of these brave lads, a thought that would have fortified and nerved them in their last desperate bid for the coast, expressed for us in one of the B.B.C. announcements, 'They knew that when they had fought their way to the coast the Royal Navy would be there ready, waiting for them.' The certain knowledge that the Navy would be there to take them back in safety to England gave them that desperate courage which enabled them to see the bitter business through to the end.

As I listened to the news that night, my thoughts travelled back to a house in Orkney, where I had seen a painting by the artist Thomas Somerscales. It was a picture on a fairly large canvas. The sky was black, scowling, squally. About the centre of the picture there was a three-masted sailing-ship. The 'royals' were clewed up, the 'topgallants' were being furled, the crew were shortening sail, the captain was bringing his ship to windward.

In the right-hand corner of the canvas there was a tiny tub of a boat, bobbing and tossing like a cork in the heavy seas. In it there were three ragged, tattered figures. Two were pulling at the oars, while one was standing up in the boat waving frantically.

Looking again towards the ship I observed that a signal had been run up the mid-mast, three flags. I asked my host to read the signal for me, and he said, 'These three flags represent the three letters B C N and the signal is: "I Will Not Abandon You."'

And so as I sat by the fire and thought of the Royal Navy's epic exploit by the sand-dunes of Dunkirk, I saw again that picture in a house in Orkney and the signal run up the mast, 'I Will Not Abandon You.' The Navy will be there.

There is similar heartening and encouragement for all mankind. Jesus Christ the Captain of our Salvation has run up that same signal for all, 'I Will Not Abandon You.'

However stormy the sea, however dark the night, however far men may stray, Jesus Christ will not abandon us. WILLIAM MOORE.

Alves, Morayshire.

Givers of Life.

The C.M.S. review of their work during 1939–40 (6d. net) opens with the searching paragraph: '"I wonder what the world is coming to?" How often this is said in days of perplexity and crisis. Very different was the spirit of the Church in the first century. As a preacher pointed out some time ago, St. Paul or one of his company would have said in any situation: "I know what has come to the world." To him the dominant fact was that Jesus Christ was alive, active, present, and at work in and through His Body, the Church, and neither "things present nor things to come" could shake his confidence. Forces of death and destruction might do their worst, but their power was limited; it was the living Christ and He only who could claim that all authority in heaven and earth had been given to Him.'

In *Givers of Life* the story is told how day by day Christ continues His life-giving work in Africa, the Near East, India, Japan, and China. There is no hiding of defects, or failures; no over-emphasis on what has been achieved.

Looking at the first chapter—that on Africa—there is an account of the barriers of superstition, drunkenness, and polygamy. An instance of superstition: 'The Government of Uganda have decided to erect a memorial pillar in Busoga on the spot where Bishop Hannington was murdered. The local inhabitants are disturbed by this proposal, and are convinced that if any calamity, great or small, befalls the district in years to come it will be due to this pillar. They are resolved, therefore, not to carry stone or take any part in the building of the memorial.'

On drunkenness a missionary reports from the Kenya highlands: 'Of late there has been a great movement of the Spirit of God which shows itself not least in the manner in which many natives have of themselves freely renounced native beer drinking. A pile of gourds, horns, and beer-making apparatus adorns our vestry, all of which have been surrendered publicly.'

Many are the signs in Africa of awakening to spiritual life. From Kampala, Archdeacon Herbert writes: 'Many comparatively well-educated young men are coming forward and are offering themselves for ordination; they are willing to give up lucrative posts and work for the Church on a lower scale of pay, so that they can help their own people in spiritual things.'

Paganism.

More than a hundred years ago, in 1834 to be precise, the poet Heine spoke of the strength of pagan forces in Germany, in words which have received dramatic fulfilment to-day. After saying how Christianity had occasionally calmed the German lust for battle, he goes on: 'But when once that restraining talisman the Cross is broken then the old combatants will rage with the fury celebrated by the Norse poets. . . . Then the old stone gods will rise from unremembered ruins and Thor will leap to life at last and bring down his gigantic hammer on the Gothic cathedrals.' 'Do not smile,' he continues. 'It is no mere phantasy . . . it will come, and when it (the German thunder) crashes, it will crash as nothing in history has crashed before; never doubt it, the hour will come.' [1]

Substitutes.

We are faced here with one of the most bewildering paradoxes of all times. How has it come about that just when knowledge of every kind has made such immense strides, brought release to the human mind, vast material benefits to the world, and drawn the world together, there should have been this setback? Darkness and superstition have fled in front of this knowledge, and in more

[1] John A. Hughes, *The Light of Christ in a Pagan World*, 27.

ways than one the earth has been opened up and set free. And yet it is in this very hour, this age of science, that men are turning again, as another writer says, to swastikas and other emblems of hope. . . . 'Now, instead of looking to the hills, they choose a wishbone maybe. *They must have something.*' That probably explains it. Something has been lost, and they do not know what. They therefore grasp at a substitute to take its place, and it is a portent of more than ordinary significance, that in some German churches the Swastika has been elevated to the level of the Cross. One arresting fact about that Swastika has impressed itself upon me. As a symbol of the Sun the Swastika should move from left to right to represent its ongoing. But the Nazi Swastika has its arms set the other way: it moves backwards. Is this the deliberate recoil from all that has stood for Christian civilization? [1]

Religious Poetry.

The Oxford University Press has added another fine volume to its Oxford Books of Verse. It is an anthology of *Christian Verse* (8s. 6d. net), chosen and edited by Lord David Cecil. The collection, from the carols and religious poems of the Middle Ages down to our own time, is full and representative.

The Introduction (pages xi. to xxxiii.) repays close attention, for to Lord Cecil this is more than a collection of religious verse; it is 'a history of Christianity in England and an exhibition of the varieties of the religious temperament.' He divides poetry into four phases, the second phase ending with Milton being the greatest, and the greatest figure in this period John Donne. 'Religion was to him so stimulating a subject that there was hardly an aspect of it that did not fire him to poetry. . . . And the Christian scheme seemed created to express his personal experience. He did not just believe in the doctrines of sin and expiation and Divine grace; he found them confirmed in his own life. Not that he was a saint. By nature Donne was rancorous, proud, morbid, and sensual. But this was an advantage to him as a religious poet. For the struggle within him between the natural man and the regenerate gave his work an extraordinary tension.'

Our own period does not yield Lord Cecil many names. Among the few are T. S. Eliot, W. Force Stead, Fredegond Shove, and Ruth Pitter. We quote Fredegond Shove's poem:

[1] John A. Hughes, *The Light of Christ in a Pagan World*, 29.

THE NEW GHOST.

'And he casting away his garment rose and came to Jesus.'

And he cast it down, down, on the green grass,
Over the young crocuses, where the dew was—
He cast the garment of his flesh that was full of death,
And like a sword his spirit showed out of the cold sheath.

He went a pace or two, he went to meet his Lord,
And, as I said, his spirit looked like a clean sword,
And seeing him the naked trees began shivering,
And all the birds cried out aloud as it were late spring.

And the Lord came on, He came down, and saw
That a soul was waiting there for Him, one without flaw,
And they embraced in the churchyard where the robins play,
And the daffodils hang their heads, as they burn away.

The Lord held his head fast, and you could see
That He kissed the unsheathed ghost that was gone free—
As a hot sun, on a March day, kisses the cold ground;
And the spirit answered, for he knew well that his peace was found.

The spirit trembled, and sprang up at the Lord's word—
As on a wild, April day, springs up a small bird—
So the ghost's feet lifting him up, he kissed the Lord's cheek,
And for the greatness of their love neither of them could speak.

But the Lord went then, to show him the way,
Over the young crocuses, under the green may
That was not quite in flower yet—to a far-distant land;
And the ghost followed, like a naked cloud holding the sun's hand.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.